DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 129 UD 030 025

AUTHOR Kirshstein, Rita; And Others
TITLE Years Two and Three of the Chelsea-BU Partnership: A Story of Survival.
INSTITUTION Pelavin Associates, Inc., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of the Under Secretary.
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 117p.; For related documents, see ED 338 748 and ED 339 776.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Dropout Prevention; Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Exigency; Governance; Higher Education; *Partnerships in Education; *Program Evaluation; Shared Resources and Services; *Student Improvement; Test Score Decline; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Boston University MA; *Chelsea School System MA

ABSTRACT

This report examines the second and third years of the Chelsea-Boston University (BU) partnership in which BU manages the Chelsea, Massachusetts, school system. The report summarizes the activities of the partnership (begun in 1989), examines the impact of key players and events, and evaluates BU's impact on Chelsea to date. The partnership's success has been mixed. One of BU's most notable achievements is reducing the dropout rate among Chelsea high school students. Considerable attention and activity was paid to the areas of professional development and salary increases for teachers and Chelsea staff, although more professional development opportunities and further salary increases are deemed necessary. Despite these successes, however, almost across the board, student test scores have actually declined since BU's arrival in Chelsea. The fiscal crisis of 1991 severely reduced Chelsea's budget as specified in the original agreement, forcing BU into a crisis-management situation while it tried to provide more with less. Ultimately, the Chelsea-BU partnership's success will be measured on the ability of the Chelesa community to administer its own schools. BU's ability to mentor community leaders could prove to be the single most important factor determining the project's long-term impact. The appendix provides a list of persons interviewed during site visits in the second and third years. (Contains four references.) (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 373 129

YEARS TWO AND THREE OF THE CHELSEA-BU PARTNERSHIP: A STORY OF SURVIVAL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PELAVIN ASSOCIATES, INC.
2030 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION • OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Years Two and Three of The Chelsea-BU Partnership: A Story of Survival

Rita Kirshstein
Diane Pelavin
Nancy Matheson
Alison Reeve

1994

Prepared Under Contract by:

PELAVIN ASSOCIATES, INC.
2030 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036

The views expressed in this report, developed under contract to the U.S. Department of Education, do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department, and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Three years after entering into an agreement with Chelsea, Massachusetts to manage the beleaguered city's school system, Boston University (BU) submitted its first progress report to the Massachusetts State Legislature in September 1992. This report drew a flurry of newspaper articles decrying BU's failure to "deliver on its promises" to improve the education of Chelsea students. The national attention that this report attracted attests to the sustained interest of the broader educational and policy communities in the Chelsea-BU school reform experiment. This interest derives from a number of sources:

- The concept of a university-school partnership. A private university managing a public school system is an intriguing concept for two distinct reasons: (1) American schools traditionally are run by locally elected or appointed school boards because it is assumed that representatives from a community can best determine the needs and interests of that community; and (2) universities are generally perceived to be producers of knowledge, not administrators involved in the translation of knowledge into practice.

- A comprehensive education reform approach. BU's approach to educational reform in Chelsea is comprehensive; it addresses social service needs, physical and mental health issues, early childhood education, before- and after-school care, and adult education, in addition to the more traditional issues of K through 12 education.

- The roles of dynamic personalities. Several engaging personalities have attracted considerable media attention since the beginning of the project. These include John Silber, President of Boston University; Diana Lam, Superintendent of the Chelsea schools for the first two years of the partnership; and Peter Greer, Chair of the Management Team for the initial two years of the project and Superintendent *ad interim* for the third year.

- The effect of financial and personnel crises on a school system. The Chelsea community and the schools have weathered a number of internal and external crises that have threatened the survival of the project. Most significant among these are:

  - The firing of Chelsea teachers and administrators. As a result of a large budget deficit, numerous administrative positions within the school system were eliminated in April 1991, including the Directors of Bilingual Education, Human Services, Special Education, and Guidance. Due to continued fiscal crises and an inability to reach an agreement with the Chelsea Teachers' Union regarding the date by which teachers needed to be notified of future employment, all Chelsea teachers were fired in June 1991. Only 187 out of 245 teachers were reinstated, late in August, for the beginning of the new school year.

- Receivership. Severe financial problems in the city resulted in Chelsea going into state receivership in September 1991, the beginning of the third year of the partnership.

- Turnover among superintendents. Considerable turnover among superintendents has plagued the project. The sudden departure of a generally popular superintendent at the end of the second year of the agreement was followed by the departure of her somewhat controversial *ad interim* replacement at the end of the third year and his subsequent replacement by a superintendent with little experience in urban school settings.

Thus to understand the Chelsea-BU partnership requires not only an account of new programs implemented under the banner of school reform but also an understanding of the unique governance structures mandated by the legislation, the powerful personalities who have been involved in the Chelsea effort, and the fiscal and personnel crises weathered by the project. This report summarizes the activities of the partnership in its second and third years, examines the impact of key players and events, and evaluates BU's impact on Chelsea to date.

Programs and Activities

Several innovative programs have been initiated by BU since the onset of the partnership. Key programs in the second and third years include:

- A "showcase" early childhood education program provides learning opportunities to many of Chelsea's three- and four-year-olds. The Early Learning Center, located on the campus of one of Chelsea's elementary schools, includes bilingual classrooms and extended day programs. The Center served approximately 200 preschool children in 1991-92. The early childhood program also incorporates several innovative home-learning and intergenerational learning projects.

- Several health-related programs have been introduced through the schools. A health clinic at the high school is staffed by a nurse practitioner and provides health services to many, often uninsured, students who would not otherwise have access to such services. Additionally, a dental program has been established to screen kindergarten through eighth-grade students for dental problems.

- An extensive and comprehensive music program has been introduced throughout the school system, providing Chelsea students not only with coherent music instruction but also with a program that, somewhat controversially, is intended to foster cooperative learning, competition, self-discipline, and increased self-esteem and responsibility.

- A number of different dropout prevention activities have been implemented since BU arrived on the scene in Chelsea. These include: (1) the Pathway School, a program funded by the RJR Nabisco Foundation to provide an alternative school for students who either have already dropped out of school or are at-risk of doing so; (2) tracking and monitoring activities that identify chronically absent students

and notify parents when their children miss five consecutive days of school; (3) Dreams and Plans, a crisis intervention and prevention program that aims to keep students in school by averting potential crises; and (4) the Digital Mentoring Program, a mentoring program that pairs Chelsea students with employees of the Digital Corporation.

Additionally, BU has devoted considerable energy to numerous professional development activities benefitting Chelsea staff. BU also secured salary increases for teachers and administrators throughout the system.

Governance Structures and Personalities

The Chelsea-BU partnership created governing bodies, advisory boards, and relationships never before tested in educational settings. At no other time has an American university, public or private, managed the day-to-day operation of an entire school system. The BU Management Team, whose membership consists of BU faculty members hand-picked by the President of BU, John Silber, operates as a school board or school committee. However, the elected Chelsea School Committee serves in an advisory capacity, reserving the right to veto Management Team decisions by a two-thirds vote. Through the third year of the project, the School Committee had exercised this privilege only once. The Management Team, for all practical purposes, disregarded the Committee's veto, forcing observers to question just how much of an influence the Committee really holds and to what extent the relationship between BU and Chelsea can legitimately be called a "partnership." Indeed, the relationship between the Management Team (BU) and the School Committee (the Chelsea community) has been tense since the project's inception.

Many other groups of key players have left their mark on the Chelsea-BU reform effort. They include: (1) three superintendents in four years; (2) a number of principals who have been faced with dramatic restructuring of the schools; (3) teachers who found themselves in the third year of the reform effort teaching larger classes and, in some cases, courses they were unfamiliar with; (4) the Chelsea Executive Advisory Committee, a group mandated by the legal agreement between Boston University and Chelsea to provide a mechanism through which the community could influence BU; (5) the Chelsea Oversight Panel created by the Massachusetts Legislature to monitor the implementation of the agreement; (6) A Different September Foundation, a private, not-for-profit entity instituted by BU to solicit financial support for the Chelsea-BU partnership; (7) influential legislators in the Massachusetts State House and Senate who have been instrumental in bringing state money into the Chelsea schools; (8) the receiver, appointed by the state in September 1991 to run the city of Chelsea; and (9) John Silber, the outspoken President of Boston University who has continued to control the day-to-day affairs of the project throughout its three year history.

The relationships among and between these groups and individuals have shaped the evolution of educational reform in Chelsea. And while much can be learned about the management of reform from these experiences, several of these relationships, for better or for worse, are unlikely to be replicable in attempts at reform elsewhere.

Financial and Personnel Crises

As the second year of the Chelsea-BU partnership (1990-91) was drawing to a close, several events signalled what would become a stressful and threatening third year of the project. These events included: (1) the failure of Chelsea voters in April 1991 to override Proposition 2 1/2, thus refusing to raise local taxes for the upcoming fiscal year to support the city's budget; and (2) the sudden resignation of the superintendent, Diana Lam, in early May to run for Mayor of Boston. Sensing imminent fiscal disaster and fearing that Chelsea would not be able to recruit the type of superintendent it wanted during such a troubled period, BU appointed Peter Greer, Dean of the School of Education and Chair of the Management Team during the first two years of the project, as Superintendent *ad interim*.

During the summer that followed, Chelsea's deficit forced a major cut in the school budget. Because the Management Team and the Chelsea Teachers' Union could not reach agreement about a clause in the teachers' contract requiring the system to notify teachers by June 15 of their employment status for the upcoming school year, all of Chelsea's teachers were laid off indefinitely. It wasn't until 14 days before the scheduled start of the 1991-92 school year that 187 out of 245 teachers were rehired. By the time the 1991-92 school year did begin in Chelsea, almost two weeks after it had been scheduled, Chelsea had been placed in state receivership.

The reduced budget forced the Management Team to make some drastic decisions, resulting in a number of program cuts and the restructuring of Chelsea's schools during the third year of the project. The middle school was completely eliminated, leaving two elementary schools housing students in grades K through 7, two elementary schools with students in grades K through 8, and one high school educating students in the 9th through 12th grades. At the high school level, school restructuring essentially resulted in the revocation of restructuring efforts implemented during the first two years of the partnership. The unanticipated and hasty restructuring also meant that some Chelsea students have experienced both structural and pedagogical changes annually. For example, eighth graders were moved into the high school and clustered during the middle of the first year of the partnership, the high school was divided into three "schools within a school" during the second year, and this organization was abandoned for a trimester system at the beginning of the third year. Thus students who were in the eighth grade in 1989-90 have spent their eighth-, ninth-, and tenth-grade years studying in a school with no structural consistency.

Measuring the Impact of Educational Reform in Chelsea

Using standard educational outcome measures to evaluate BU's performance managing the Chelsea schools at the three year mark produces a mixed picture, at best. One of BU's most notable achievements is reducing the dropout rate among Chelsea high school students. Of BU's original 17 goals for the partnership's ten-year tenure, it is the reduction of dropouts that the university has most clearly made some headway by the end of year three. The annual dropout rate declined from 18 percent in the year prior to BU's assuming management of the Chelsea schools (1988-89) to 7 percent in the third year of the agreement (1991-92). Although it is not possible to attribute student decisions to remain in or drop out of school directly to student participation in any of the numerous dropout prevention programs BU instituted, it is likely that BU's efforts in this area have indeed influenced the decision of some Chelsea students to remain in school.

BU can also claim some success in other areas. Considerable activity in the professional development arena coupled with salary increases for teachers and administrators testify to considerable attention devoted to the needs of Chelsea staff. The reactions of Chelsea teachers and administrators to BU's efforts in these areas are generally positive; their major criticism is that they require more — more professional development opportunities and still further salary increases to bring their salaries into line with those of teachers in other Massachusetts school districts.

These quantifiable successes, however, are often overshadowed by the rather dismal performance of Chelsea students on a number of standardized tests. Almost across the board, test scores have actually declined since BU's arrival in Chelsea. While the percentage of third graders passing the Massachusetts reading, writing, and mathematics basic skills test increased between the 1988-89 and 1990-91 academic years, the percentage of sixth and ninth graders passing these tests fell. In addition, Scholastic Aptitude Test scores of Chelsea seniors rose between 1988-89 and 1990-91 but plummeted in 1991-92, when the average score was more than 40 points lower than the average 1988-89 score.

Conclusion

John Silber has stated that the partnership's most notable accomplishment after three years is "survival." BU legitimately deserves credit for surviving — for remaining with the partnership. The fiscal crises of 1991 resulted in a reduction in the school budget so severe that Chelsea could not meet its share of the budget as specified in the initial agreement. BU could have legally withdrawn from the partnership prior to year three. By staying with the partnership, BU was forced into a situation of "crisis management," operating a school system, trying to provide more with less. The partnership really did more than survive. As has been noted above, the partnership has achieved some success both in measurable outcomes and in the establishment of some promising programs.

However, in one very important way, "survival" is not enough. Ten years down the road the success of the partnership, never designed to be permanent, will not be measured solely in dropout rates and test scores and numbers and qualities of programs. Success, or failure, will also be assessed in the ability of the Chelsea community to administer its own schools. Thus the partnership's ultimate success is dependent upon BU's ability and willingness to coach the Chelsea community — specifically members of the School Committee — on how to run the city's schools. BU's failure to mentor leaders of the Chelsea community could, in the end, prove to be the single most important factor determining the project's long-term impact.

Lessons Learned

Although it is too soon to determine whether Boston University's efforts in managing the Chelsea schools should be considered a success or a failure, lessons can be gleaned from this reform effort that can benefit other outside entities operating schools. These lessons include:

Lesson 1: **School reform in high poverty school districts requires attention to the physical, social, family, and economic problems of students as well as their educational needs.** BU's recognition of the multidimensional needs

of Chelsea students led to the development of many innovative programs that have been well received by students and the community.

Lesson 2: **Outside reform agents, whether universities or private corporations, should involve the community in the process from the outset.** An entity attempting to manage schools will be better able to ensure the acceptance and institutionalization of new educational ideas and programs if the community is actively involved from the very beginning.

Lesson 3: **Outside reform agents should be sensitive to different cultural and community perspectives.** Those involved in school reform need to recognize and be sensitive to the different cultures and orientations of all key players. This includes teachers and administrators in the schools as well as community members.

Lesson 4: **Reform agents must be prepared to commit great amounts of time and energy.** The commitment of considerable resources, both in terms of time and energy, appears to be needed to get reform efforts moving. Furthermore, reform agents need to be prepared to tap multiple sources of funds, materials, and human resources simultaneously.

Lesson 5: **Those involved with reforming schools need to develop both short- and long-term goals, but they should be flexible in the objectives they design to attain these goals.** While carefully planned goals appear to be critical to the management of school reform, these goals need to be flexible enough to allow for adaptations in schedules and programs intended to support their attainment. BU's experience coping with Chelsea's financial crises and the unanticipated reduction in financial resources illustrates this principle.

Lesson 6: **School reform requires patience from all involved.** Systems, educational or otherwise, cannot be transformed overnight. Systemic change requires both reformers and their critics to expect and accept incremental change and to postpone assessment of the endeavor as a whole to a time when educational programs and practices have had sufficient time to be embraced by individuals and institutionalized by schools.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

PROLOGUE 1

CHAPTER 1: The Chelsea-BU Partnership: An Overview 3

Introduction 3

The Chelsea Community: A Capsule Description 4

Key Events in Years 2 and 3 of the Chelsea-BU Project 6

The Study and Methodology 9

CHAPTER 2: Who's Got the Influence?
The Roles of Key Players in the Chelsea-BU Partnership 11

The "Core Players" 11
- Boston University Management Team 12
- Chelsea School Committee 14
- Superintendents 16
- Chelsea School Principals 18
- Chelsea School Teachers 20

The "Supporting Cast" 22
- Chelsea Executive Advisory Committee 22
- The Chelsea Oversight Panel 24
- A Different September Foundation 24
- Chelsea's Legislators in the State House and Senate 26
- The Receiver 27
- John Silber 28

Summary 29

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

CHAPTER 3: The Transformation of the Chelsea Schools: Structural and Pedagogical Changes 31

Early Childhood Education 32

Chelsea's Elementary Schools 33

Middle School Education in Chelsea 35

Chelsea High School 36

Staff Development Activities 39

Conclusion 41

CHAPTER 4: In the Name of Educational Reform: Programs and Activities 43

Early Childhood Programs 43
- The Early Learning Center 43
- Kindergarten Classrooms 44
- Chelsea Home Instruction Program 44
- High Technology Home Daycare Project 45
- Future Goals for Early Childhood Education 45

Adult Education 46
- The Intergenerational Literacy Project 46
- Adult Basic Education 46

The Music Program 47

Dropout Prevention Activities 49
- Tracking and Monitoring Dropouts 49
- Chelsea Futures 49
- Voyager Academy 50
- High Expectations Learning Program 50
- The Pathway School 50
- Dreams and Plans 52
- The Digital Mentoring Program 52
- The Boston University School of Social Work 53

Tutoring Program 53

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

CHAPTER 4: In the Name of Educational Reform: Programs and Activities (Continued)

Special Needs Populations 54
Chapter 1 Program 55
Bilingual Education 56
Special Education Program 58

Health and Human Services Activities 59
Chelsea High School Health Clinic 60
The Dentistry Program 61
Health Issues Curricula 61
AIDS Programs 62
Substance Abuse Programs 62
BU's School of Social Work 62
Health and Human Services Council 65

Conclusion 65

CHAPTER 5: The Impact of Educational Reform 67

Programs and Goals 69

Progress Toward Goal Attainment 69

Conclusion 86

CHAPTER 6: Educational Reform and the Chelsea Community: Involvement and Reactions 87

Factions Within the Chelsea Community 88

BU's Involvement With the Chelsea Community 89
The Role of BU's Official Liaison to the Chelsea Community 89
BU's Decision-Making Style and the Chelsea Community 91

CHAPTER 7: The Chelsea-BU Partnership: A Story of Survival 95

EPILOGUE 101

APPENDIX A: List of Persons Interviewed During Site Visits of Years 2 and 3 ..... A-1

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit Number		Page
1	Chelsea-BU Policy Goals and Supporting Activities	69
2	Percentage of Students Passing all Three Components (Reading, Writing, and Mathematics) of the Massachusetts Basic Skills Test, by Grade (1988-89 to 1990-91)	75
3	Average Combined Score of Chelsea Senior Class Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and Achievement Tests (1988-89 to 1991-92)	76
4	Annual Number and Percentage of Students Dropping Out of School in Chelsea, by Grade (1988-89 to 1991-92)	78
5	Average Daily Attendance Rates for the Chelsea Public Schools (1988-89 to 1991-92)	79

PROLOGUE

How does one evaluate the efforts of a major private university to manage a public school system when no such undertaking has ever been attempted before?

How should one critique the progress of an educational reform effort conceived during a period of tremendous economic prosperity but implemented during a severe recession?

What should be considered fair and reasonable expectations for success after three years of a proposed ten-year project when economic hardships drove the community into state receivership and forced it to renege on its agreement to provide a specific level of educational funding?

How can one convey the atmosphere of an experiment in which outsiders, grounded in a different intellectual and social culture, must convince a community to change its attitudes and priorities with regard to education?

How can one capture the often overt hostility and mistrust between the two parties comprising the so-called partnership?

The issues raised by these questions characterize the Chelsea-Boston University Partnership, an educational reform effort that has captured the attention of educators, policymakers, and the general public nationwide. After three basically tumultuous years, one could question the impact and the future viability of this unique experiment in school reform. Certainly, the partnership cannot be described as successful by most standard educational measures. In fact, many critics have concluded that the partnership to date should be considered a failure. However, both Boston University and Chelsea point to the numerous, unanticipated circumstances they encountered in the first three years. To what extent can these external circumstances be enlisted to justify what appears to many as a lack of progress in improving the quality of education in Chelsea? When asked at the end of the third year of the project to describe the biggest accomplishment of the Chelsea-BU Partnership, John Silber, President of Boston University and the force behind the endeavor, said simply, "Survival."

This report examines the many events, programs, personalities, conflicts, and philosophies that characterized the second and third years of the partnership, providing a record of this unique school reform effort.

CHAPTER 1

The Chelsea-BU Partnership: An Overview

Introduction

On June 13, 1989, Michael Dukakis, then governor of Massachusetts, signed a bill authorizing the transfer of responsibility for administering the Chelsea, Massachusetts public school system to Boston University (BU). BU would thus function as a school board, overseeing the day-to-day operations of the six Chelsea schools that were serving approximately 3,600 students. This legislation had no precedent, for never before had a private university anywhere in the country managed an entire public school system.

Even before the Chelsea schools opened their doors under BU's management in the fall of 1989, the arrangement had captured the attention of a wide audience that included educators, students of educational reform, and the general public. Intense opposition from the Chelsea Hispanic community, a lawsuit filed by the Chelsea Teachers' Union and supported by the American Federation of Teachers, reservations expressed by the Massachusetts State Board of Education and the national Parent Teacher Association, and concerns about BU's top-down management style all helped to thrust the Chelsea-BU experiment into the limelight even before it was off the ground. A detailed account of the events leading up to the Chelsea-BU agreement, as well as a description of the first year of the project, is provided in *Implementation of the Chelsea School Project: A Case Study* (Pelavin, Siegel, and Kirshstein; 1991).

Public interest in the project has been sustained throughout the course of BU's involvement in the Chelsea schools. This interest derives from a number of sources:

- The concept of a university-school system partnership. A private university managing a public school system is an intriguing concept for two distinct reasons: (1) American schools traditionally are run by locally elected or appointed school boards because it is assumed that representatives from a community can best identify the needs and interests of that community; and (2) universities are generally perceived to be producers of knowledge, not administrators involved in the translation of knowledge into practice.

87	*Jun 89*	*Aug 89*	*Sep 89*
Chelsea School Committee requests that BU manage the Chelsea schools	*Chelsea and BU enter into a 10-year partnership*	*Diana Lam is chosen as superintendent*	*The first school year under the Chelsea-BU partnership begins*

- A comprehensive approach to education reform. BU's approach to educational reform in Chelsea is comprehensive; it addresses social service needs, physical and mental health issues, early childhood education, before- and after-school care, and adult education, in addition to the more traditional issues of K through 12 education.

- The influence of dynamic personalities. Several engaging personalities have attracted considerable media attention since the beginning of the project. These include John Silber, President of Boston University; Diana Lam, Superintendent of the Chelsea schools for the first two years of the partnership; and Peter Greer, Chair of the Management Team for the initial two years of the project and Superintendent *ad interim* for the third year.

- The effects of financial and personnel crises on a school system. The Chelsea community and the schools have weathered a number of internal and external crises that have threatened the survival of the project. Most significant among these are: (1) the firing of all Chelsea teachers and administrators in June of 1991, which was the result of BU's and the Chelsea Teachers' Union's inability to reach an agreement regarding the date by which teachers needed to be notified of further employment; only 187 out of 245 teachers were reinstated, for the beginning of the new school year; (2) severe financial problems in the city resulted in Chelsea going into state receivership in September 1991, the beginning of the third year of the partnership; and (3) considerable turnover among superintendents has plagued the project.

As a unique and comprehensive attempt at educational reform, the Chelsea-BU project has also attracted the attention of the U.S. Department of Education. As part of its ongoing interest in this reform effort, the Department has funded this study to examine the events and programs of the second and third years of the project. This report updates the implementation study in many respects and reviews the second and third years in the history of the Chelsea-BU agreement. Earlier reports have focused on the implementation of the agreement (See Pelavin, Siegel, and Kirshstein, *Implementation of the Chelsea School Project: A Case Study*; 1991) and teachers' reactions to the project (Kirshstein and Pelavin, *On the Front Line: Chelsea Teachers and the Chelsea-BU Agreement*, 1992).

The Chelsea Community: A Capsule Description

It is difficult to understand the Chelsea-BU project without some sense of the Chelsea community itself. What led the Chelsea community, despite dissension, to vote to relinquish the

Sep 89	*Jan 90*	*Jul 90*	*Sep 90*
8th grade students moved to high school	*Clustering adopted in the high school for eighth graders*	*Parent Information Center opens*	*The second school year under the Chelsea-BU partnership begins*

management of its schools to an outside entity? What are the assets and liabilities, contributions and detractions, of the community whose schools BU is attempting to improve? In short, what must one know about the Chelsea community in order to understand the Chelsea-BU partnership?

First and, perhaps, foremost, Chelsea is an extremely poor community, among the poorest in the state of Massachusetts. According to 1990 census data, its median household income is $25,144; per capita income is $11,559. Twenty-four percent of Chelsea residents live below the poverty line, but 39 percent of Chelsea's children are from families living below the poverty line. Twelve percent of the labor force is unemployed, and 37 percent of the residents over the age of 25 have no high school diploma. About one quarter of Chelsea households are headed by single women (Massachusetts Institute for Social and Economic Research, 1991, 1992a, 1992b, 1992c).

Equally salient to education issues in Chelsea is the community's racial and multilingual composition. Chelsea's population of 28,000 (about half of what it was 30 years ago) is heavily minority; Hispanics, Asians, and African-Americans comprise about half of the city's documented population, and estimates of undocumented Hispanic residents range from 5,000 to 10,000. When the partnership began, the student population was 55 percent Hispanic, 28 percent white, 12 percent Asian, and 5 percent black. Thus, many Chelsea students fall into at least two "at-risk" categories: they are poor and they are not native English speakers.

Although not technically urban, the community suffers most of the same woes other depressed urban communities endure. Drugs and drug-related violence are widespread, as are gangs. At any point in time, approximately 25 percent of all teenage girls in Chelsea are either pregnant or already mothers. Student scores on statewide achievement tests are low and the dropout rate high.

At the onset of the partnership, Chelsea's per student spending on education was among the lowest in the state. By the 1990-91 school year, however, per pupil expenditure had increased to $4,598, raising Chelsea to about the 40th percentile among Massachusetts communities (90 percent of the mean). In years two and three of the partnership, Chelsea contributed approximately 30 cents of every tax dollar to education, increased from about 17 cents on the dollar prior to the partnership. (Additional money in the form of grants solicited by Boston University and emergency aid from the state supplemented Chelsea's financing of the schools.)

Through the end of the third year of the partnership, Chelsea remained the only Massachusetts community never to take advantage of the state's 55 year old school site funding program, which provides communities with anywhere between 50 and 90 percent of the funds used to build new school facilities. Through special legislation, the state of Massachusetts would provide 95 percent of the costs of constructing new schools in Chelsea. Initially resistant to

Sep 90	*Sep 90*	*Oct 90*	*Jan 91*
The Student Health Center opens at the high school	*The high school is divided into several schools within a school*	*The Early Learning Center opens*	*A Different September Foundation established to solicit and receive funding for partnership*

applying for such funds because of desegregation requirements attached to the money, Chelsea did develop a desegregation plan approved by the state. However, resistance to building new schools still remained, despite the fact that the community would benefit from both the additional jobs and revenue generated from construction workers spending money in the community. (It should be noted that during year four of the partnership, funds for the construction of new schools were finally appropriated through the receiver's office.)

While these demographic statistics capture certain critical features of the Chelsea community, data are not available to describe the patronage that mark the political and bureaucratic climates of Chelsea. Being a friend or relative of someone in Chelsea has often outweighed qualifications when applying for jobs. Indeed, BU appointed one of the first superintendents hired from outside the Chelsea community in years when it hired Diana Lam, a move initially opposed by many in Chelsea.

Nor can data convey the predominant role of unions in the community, particularly the police and firefighter unions. There is no question that the unions in Chelsea have ruled with an iron hand. Some of the toughest battles the receiver has had to fight since assuming responsibility have been against the well-entrenched practices of the police and fire departments and their respective union representatives.

It is noteworthy, however, that the Chelsea Teachers' Union does not brandish influence comparable in any way to that of the police and fire unions. The union's influence deficit is surely another factor resulting in the traditionally meager allocation of funds to the schools (and to the low salaries paid to Chelsea teachers relative to neighboring communities). Speculation as to why the Teachers' Union is less effective than Chelsea's other unions suggests several possible explanations, ranging from the impact of major fires, which destroyed large parts of the city in 1908 and 1973, to the "macho" character of the town that allows male-dominated unions to wield more power than a female-dominated one such as the teachers' union.

Such complex circumstances hardly promote educational success; managing a school system in Chelsea would certainly prove to be a daunting undertaking to even the most seasoned educational administrators.

Key Events in Years 2 and 3 of the Chelsea-BU Project

As documented in the implementation study, the first year of the agreement was fraught with tensions between BU and the Chelsea community. Comparatively speaking, the second year

Apr 91	*May 91*	*Jun 91*	*Jul 91*
The Proposition 2 1/2 override vote needed to infuse vital funds into the city fails	*Chelsea school superintendent Diana Lam resigns*	*All Chelsea teachers receive termination notification due to lack of school budget*	*P. Greer resigns role as chair of BU mgmt. team to become Chelsea school superintendent ad interim*

of the Chelsea-BU partnership was basically uneventful. Many of the programs implemented during the 1989-90 school year were extended and expanded in 1990-91. In addition, several new programs planned during the first year got underway. The Parent Information Center opened its doors in July 1990, the Early Learning Center in October; the Student Health Center at the high school also opened that fall. Perhaps the most significant "achievement," however, was the fact that no new conflicts or controversies arose between Chelsea and BU. Though hardly "kissing cousins," Chelsea and BU had begun to tolerate one another.

In many respects, year two can be described as the calm before the storm. As the 1990-91 school year was drawing to a close, several events signalled what would become a stressful and threatening third year of the Chelsea-BU project. In April 1991 Chelsea voters failed to override Proposition 2 1/2, thus refusing to raise local taxes for the upcoming fiscal year to support the city's budget. The Massachusetts Proposition 2 1/2 legislation caps local tax assessment on real estate and personal property at 2 1/2 percent per year, but localities can override the statewide legislation for a given fiscal year with a majority vote. When Chelsea voters failed to do so, by a margin of almost three to one, they denied the city $2 million in additional tax revenue that would have covered most of the city's $2.4 million shortfall in fiscal year 91. The failure to override Proposition 2 1/2 brought Chelsea considerably closer to the fiscal collapse that ultimately led to receivership.

The relative quiet of the 1990-91 school year was also shattered by Diana Lam's sudden resignation on May 3, 1991. To the surprise, disappointment, and anger of many in the Chelsea community, Lam resigned her position as Superintendent to run for Mayor of Boston. Despite the fact that she had been a candidate for the Boston School Superintendency earlier that year, many in the Chelsea community, particularly those involved with the schools, felt betrayed not only by her sudden departure but also by what many perceived to be her naiveté in running against Ray Flynn, the two-term incumbent.[1]

Fearing that Chelsea would not be able to recruit the type of superintendent it wanted on such short notice and in the midst of fiscal uncertainty, BU appointed Peter Greer, Dean of the

---

[1] With no backing from standard Massachusetts political channels, Lam approached the mayoral race with the same zeal with which she tackled the Chelsea superintendency. But Diana Lam's official candidacy lasted less than 72 hours. Questions raised about her husband's and her own real estate holdings (they were cited for violations by the Rent Equity Board and Inspectional Services Department) and about their failure to file 1988 and 1989 state tax returns until after she entered the mayoral race forced her to withdraw as a candidate almost as suddenly as she entered the race. Lam, however, had already resigned her position from the Chelsea schools; there was no way for her to return to Chelsea.

Aug 91	*Aug 91*	*Sep 91*	*Sep 91*
187 out of 245 teachers reinstated	*BU management team approves reorganization of Chelsea schools*	*City of Chelsea placed into receivership; Mass. State appoints James Carlin as receiver*	*The delayed school year finally begins*

School of Education and Chair of the Management Team during the first two years of the project, as superintendent *ad interim*. Reactions to this appointment were mixed. Many felt that the Chelsea superintendent should not have direct ties with BU; after all, one of Lam's most important contributions to the project had been her ability to mediate between the Chelsea community and BU. Could someone with ties to BU as strong as Greer's, someone who had repeatedly embraced BU's top-down management style, recognize and represent the interests of the Chelsea community? On the other hand, many understood that it was truly an awkward time to bring a new superintendent into Chelsea.

Peter Greer assumed the role of superintendent just in time to lead the Chelsea schools through what would become one of the worst fiscal crises in recent years to strike a Massachusetts community. In describing the first few months of his superintendency, Greer stated, "The summer of 1991 was the worst summer of my life."

One aspect of the chaos of the summer and fall of 1991 was the impact of the city's fiscal crisis on Chelsea's public school teachers. With a deficit of $9.5 million, the city of Chelsea was forced to cut the school budget considerably. With two months remaining in the school year, several key administrative positions were eliminated, forcing other administrators to assume an even wider range of responsibilities.

What followed was a series of events that underscored the teachers' precarious position within the faltering city structure. In early June, the city could no longer meet its payroll commitments. Chelsea's public school teachers (along with other city personnel) went without paychecks for six days. Because BU's Management Team and the Chelsea Teachers' Union could not reach agreement about a clause in the teachers' contract requiring the system to notify teachers of their employment status for the upcoming school year by June 15, all of Chelsea's 245 public school teachers were laid off indefinitely while the BU Management Team struggled to "reconstruct" the schools with a budget reduced by over $4.3 million (an approximate 25 percent reduction). Only 14 days before the scheduled start of the 1991-92 school year, 187 teachers were recalled, leaving many jobless teachers and crowded classrooms.

The teacher layoffs were only one manifestation of Chelsea's escalating fiscal crisis. Indeed, the city's finances forced the Chelsea schools to delay opening for almost two weeks. By the time the school year did begin on September 16, 1991, the city of Chelsea had been placed in receivership by a vote of the state legislature on September 11. Not since 1934 had a city in the state of Massachusetts been placed under state receivership.

The receivership legislation, supported by Chelsea's state representative and senator as well as the Mayor of Chelsea, passed the state house and senate. This bill removed Chelsea's mayor from office and reduced all other elected officials to an advisory capacity. Furthermore,

Feb 92	*Jun 92*	*Jun 92*	*Jul 92*
Chelsea receives $1.2 million in emergency educational assistance	*P. Greer resigns as Chelsea's superintendent ad interim*	*The third school year under the Chelsea-BU agreement ends*	*John Gawrys begins as Chelsea's 3rd superintendent since inception of the Chelsea-BU partnership*

the state-appointed receiver was given complete control over the city budget, although he did not have the authority to override Proposition 2 1/2 without the voters' consent. The receiver could raise and impose fees, and he could choose to ignore union contracts. Two days after this legislation passed, Governor Weld appointed James Carlin receiver.

To the Chelsea-BU partnership, receivership meant potential financial stability, at least in the long run, and support for the Chelsea schools. It also brought two very strong personalities — James Carlin and John Silber — into the same arena, an arena of resentment and suspicion but occasionally, cautious optimism that the work they might accomplish would be of value to the community they agreed to serve.

The Study and Methodology

The purpose of this study is to report and analyze the events of the second and third years of the Chelsea-BU partnership. To this end, a number of different activities were undertaken, including:

- A series of site visits to Chelsea during the second and third years during which we interviewed key players in the reform effort as well as community representatives. (See Appendix A for a list of all persons interviewed during the 1990-91 and 1991-92 school years.) We also attended a number of community and school meetings including those of the BU Management Team, the Chelsea School Committee, and the Chelsea Oversight Panel, as well as a community forum presenting superintendent candidates, a community budget hearing, and a financial aid information meeting for students and their parents.

- The acquisition of data from the computerized Chelsea student information system.

- The monitoring of activities in the schools and the community through minutes of meetings, videotapes, reports, and local newspapers.

As in the earlier implementation study, this report attempts not only to describe the second and third years of the Chelsea-BU partnership through the eyes of key players in the reform effort but also to analyze and interpret these perceptions and events. The next chapter of this report, "Who's Got the Influence? The Roles of Key Players in the Chelsea-BU Partnership," examines the participation and impact of 11 different groups or individuals whose mark has been left on the project. Chapter 3 looks at some of the major organizational changes that have occurred in the Chelsea schools, particularly the introduction of a major early childhood education program, the reorganization of the high school, and the elimination of the middle school.

In Chapter 4, we describe a number of key programs that have been implemented in the Chelsea schools. The next chapter examines early indicators of the impact of all of these activities on both students and on the attainment of BU's original goals. The reactions of the community are the subject of the sixth chapter. In the final chapter, we provide an assessment of the project's strengths and weaknesses.

CHAPTER 2

Who's Got the Influence?
The Roles of Key Players in the Chelsea-BU Partnership

The story of educational reform in Chelsea is essentially two stories. One is a story of educational programs and the accompanying philosophies and theories which guide the implementation and operation of these programs. The other is a story of governance and, to some extent, personalities. The Chelsea-BU partnership created governing bodies and advisory boards that had never before been tested in educational settings. From the outset, tensions arose among some of these bodies, particularly between the BU Management Team and the Chelsea School Committee. By the end of the third year of the partnership, the relationship between these two bodies, while more cordial on the surface than it had been in earlier years, continued to be marked by mutual distrust and, to some extent, disrespect.

Many different players have influenced the development of the reform effort in Chelsea. The players can be roughly divided into two groups: the "core players" who are directly involved with educational structures and reform and the "supporting cast" who remain more peripheral to the work that occurs in the schools. The "core players" either make policies that directly affect the day-to-day operations of the schools (e.g., the Management Team) or advise on such policies (e.g., the School Committee) or implement them (superintendents, principals, and teachers). Members of the "supporting cast" function in a more remote capacity. They serve, at least in theory, as "watchdogs" (e.g., Chelsea Oversight Panel), as mechanisms through which the broader Chelsea community might become involved (e.g., the Chelsea Executive Advisory Committee), or as fundraisers (A Different September Foundation). And still other individuals, because of their unique roles and special relationships to the Chelsea community, have exerted considerable influence on the direction of the Chelsea-BU partnership (Chelsea's state legislators, the receiver, and John Silber).

This chapter documents the formal and informal roles of these many groups and key players in the Chelsea-BU partnership. In the years covered in this report, the relationships among and between the many groups and individuals have had significant effects on the evolution of educational reform in Chelsea. Yet, while much can be learned about the management of educational reform from these experiences, several of these relationships, for better or for worse, are unlikely to be replicable in attempts at reform elsewhere.

The "Core Players"

The "core players" to the reform of the Chelsea educational system work more or less directly with the schools. They make and implement policies that affect the day-to-day operations of the schools or they have key advisory roles with regard to these policies. It is these people who are more visible with regard to the reform effort, and it is here, between groups with varying ideas and sometimes conflicting interests, that the power struggles most often occur.

Boston University Management Team

The Management Team has been the central decision-making body since the start of the Chelsea-BU partnership. Handpicked from the BU faculty by John Silber, its membership has remained fairly constant during the first three years of the partnership. However, the Management Team has weathered the turnover of two chairpersons during this time. When Peter Greer, Chair of the Management Team during the first two years of the project, assumed the superintendency of the Chelsea schools on an *ad interim* basis for year three of the partnership, Ted Sharp was appointed to lead the team. After serving in their respective roles for one year, both Greer and Sharp resigned to accept positions as headmasters of private boarding schools.

Greer and Sharp brought different leadership styles to the Management Team. Greer has been characterized as a high energy manager who tended to generate a range of interesting ideas but did not always prioritize to maximize accomplishments. Sharp, on the other hand, appeared to be less frenetic and more organized than Greer. Yet it is difficult to determine exactly what Sharp's leadership brought to the Management Team and what specifically was accomplished during his one-year tenure.

There has also been some turnover in the general membership of the Management Team during years two and three of the partnership. The Management Team in year three of the partnership included six original members with continued assistance from BU's legal counsel, Michael Rosen. The original members include:

- Ted Sharp, assistant dean for special programs in the School of Education and Chair of the Management Team during year three, he resigned at the end of year three to become headmaster of a private school;
- Carol Greenes, associate dean for research, development, and advanced academic programs and a professor of mathematics education in the School of Education;
- Robert Sperber, special assistant to John Silber and professor of education, he also serves as Director of BU's Leadership Academy, which prepares principals for the Boston Public Schools;
- Roselmina (Lee) Indrisano, head of the School of Education's Department of Developmental Studies and Counseling Psychology;
- Paul Clemente, BU's associate vice president for financial affairs; and
- Robert Master, M.D., chief of the Health Services Section of the School of Public Health.

Two new members joined the team during the second and third years of the partnership:

- Alicia Borinsky, Professor of Modern Foreign Languages, replaced Maria Brisk on the Management Team early in 1991;[1] and

- Edwin DeLattre stepped in as Dean of BU's School of Education during the end of the 1990-91 school year to enable Peter Greer to prepare for his role as Superintendent *ad interim* of the Chelsea schools. He also served as a member of the Management Team during year three of the partnership.

During years two and three, the Management Team continued to confront the friction that has existed between BU and various groups within Chelsea since the beginning of the partnership. BU has made some strides in this area by attempting to be more responsive to the ideas and concerns of the Chelsea School Committee and other community groups, although BU still makes many of its decisions without involving the appropriate community groups. As a result, perceptions of BU are still considerably divided.

One example that is particularly illustrative is the Management Team's rejection of a proposal to allow the distribution of condoms in the health clinic at the high school. The School Committee, with the support of the community, later overrode the decision. Nonetheless, the Management Team failed to surrender to the override and stalled on the issue through the end of the school year.

Although none of the other issues which the Management Team addressed during years two and three attracted quite the attention of the condom issue, the team dealt with many critical issues that directly affected the education of Chelsea students. For the most part, the activities of the Management Team were a direct response to Chelsea's rapidly declining fiscal situation. Key administrative personnel were eliminated at the end of the second year, all teachers were fired at that time, and the schools were radically restructured to accommodate a reduced teaching force. In addition, the Management Team hired Chelsea's third superintendent, John Gawrys, at the end of year three.

There is some question as to whether the Management Team, after three years of running the Chelsea schools takes the School Committee and the broader Chelsea community as seriously as it could. If a goal of the partnership is to demonstrate how a school system "should" be run, one must ask at what point in its proposed ten-year tenure in Chelsea the Management Team will see fit to incorporate and "train" those who will be responsible once again for running the schools after BU's departure. So far, this does not appear to be happening.

---

[1] Because of her dislike of politics, Maria Brisk resigned from the Management Team during the second year of the project. Involved in the development of bilingual programs for the Chelsea schools before the partnership got underway, Brisk has remained a familiar face in the Chelsea classrooms.

Chelsea School Committee

The role, both formal and informal, of the School Committee within the decision-making structure of the Chelsea schools has been an issue since the inception of the Chelsea-BU partnership. The School Committee essentially relinquished its responsibilities to the BU Management Team when it approved the partnership agreement, and, although it retained the authority to override Management Team decisions by a two-thirds vote, it has chosen to exercise this right only once to date.

Receivership distanced the School Committee even further from its original decision-making role since, ultimately, even the Management Team's decisions could be overturned by the receiver's office. However, at least one committee member has indicated that the receivership had no direct impact on the Committee since, effectively, the Committee has been in receivership since BU took over.

The composition of the School Committee has changed radically since it endorsed the Chelsea-BU agreement in 1989. Only three of the seven original members remain on the committee, and two of these, Anthony Tiro and Lydia Walata, were critics of BU's management of the school system during the first year of the partnership. The current School Committee includes six members:

- Anthony Tiro chaired the School Committee during the third year of the partnership. An ardent supporter of education for all of Chelsea's youth, Tiro has criticized some of BU's policies but has acknowledged that BU has become more responsive to the concerns of the School Committee and the Chelsea community.

- Morris Seigel, a former Chelsea teacher and principal, has remained a staunch supporter of the Chelsea-BU partnership.

- Rosemary Carlisle, elected in 1990 to replace former School Committee member Andrew Quigley, has served as the School Committee liaison to the Boston University Management Team since early 1992.

- Lydia Walata cast one of the two original dissenting votes against the agreement. While Walata has questioned the extent to which BU responds to School Committee recommendations, she has noted an improvement in the relationship between these key groups during year three of the partnership.

- Marta Rosa is the first Hispanic resident of Chelsea to be elected to the School Committee. She has vocally opposed the agreement and has supported very few of BU's decisions and programs.

- Harry German, elected in 1992 to replace retiring Committee member Elizabeth McBride, has voiced his mistrust of BU. While active on a variety of community boards and committees, the newest member of the School Committee has no children and opposes a number of School Committee recommendations, including the building of new schools in Chelsea.

Although the six School Committee members represent different segments of the Chelsea community and often take opposing positions on issues, one commonality, in particular, is worth noting. None of the current School Committee members have children in the Chelsea public schools.

The Committee's perceptions of the Management Team have remained divided during years two and three of the partnership. BU's efforts to stabilize its relationship with the School Committee have largely failed, in part due to the turnover of Committee members. Supporters of the partnership have applauded the development and expansion of educational programs and activities in Chelsea during years two and three, especially in the face of severe fiscal constraints. A number of School Committee members have also recognized improvements in BU's relationship with the Committee and the larger Chelsea community and have attributed some of the change to the visibility and approachability of Superintendent *ad interim* Peter Greer.

However, Chelsea residents still criticize BU for failing to respond to the suggestions and concerns of the School Committee. Neither opponents nor proponents believe that BU includes the School Committee in important decisions. For example, when BU presented its proposed school budget for the 1992-93 school year to the public in the spring of 1992, the School Committee was seeing the budget for the first time.

Despite concerns about its role and effectiveness in shaping educational decisions in Chelsea, the School Committee has been active during partnership years two and three. One issue in particular both attracted considerable community and national attention and reinforced the chasm between the Management Team and the School Committee in the third year. The issue, presented earlier in this chapter, concerned the potential distribution of condoms at the Chelsea High School health clinic. Despite widespread community support and a well organized student effort favoring distribution, the Management Team rejected a motion to allow condoms to be distributed on school property in November 1991. Only Robert Master, Chief of the Health Services Section of BU's School of Public Health, voted in favor of the measure. For the first time in the history of the partnership and with widespread support from the Chelsea community, the School Committee overrode this decision in January 1992.[2]

By the end of the school year, condoms were still not available at the high school. Although BU claimed to be investigating liability issues, it appears that BU was simply not complying with the School Committee's override of its decision. The Management Team's failure to allow the distribution of condoms in the high school by the end of the school year raises serious questions about the actual influence and effectiveness of the School Committee.

---

[2] It is interesting that the first Management Team decision the School Committee felt compelled to override was not about a direct educational program but rather a health and social issue. However, health issues do not go against BU's original goals and general plans for reforming the schools in Chelsea; its "comprehensive" approach to reform does incorporate health and social concerns.

Superintendents

The average tenure of school superintendents nationwide in 1990 was approximately 6.2 years (American Association of School Administrators). Since the inception of the Chelsea-BU partnership in 1989-90, Chelsea has had three different individuals serve as superintendent. This lack of administrative continuity in the early years of the project has raised many concerns about both BU's ability to retain people in this role and the project's ability to maintain itself on a steady course. For with each new superintendent comes a new philosophy, a new and different administrative style, and a new and distinct personality.

One of BU's first steps upon taking control of the schools was to hire a new superintendent, Diana Lam. As the first superintendent in many years to be brought in from outside the Chelsea community, she found herself frequently mediating between BU and the Chelsea community. Lam tackled this largely thankless task tirelessly. Although she strived to serve as a spokesperson for the Chelsea community, she did not have the unanimous support of the community behind her. Despite her own Hispanic origins, Lam's most vocal opposition came from a segment of this group. The source of this opposition is unclear.

One of Lam's key assets was her autonomy. While she worked closely with BU in implementing many of its programs, she was autonomous enough, at times, to initiate programs that were independent of BU's direction. For example, she quickly recognized a number of serious problems in the middle and high schools, and, rather than wait for BU to take action, she introduced several programmatic and organizational changes right away. She implemented "schools within a school" at the high school and moved the eighth graders into their own cluster within the high school. However, tensions between Lam and BU, particularly between Lam and Greer, apparently contributed to Lam's decision to resign after a two-year stint. In Lam's own words, "There were too many bosses; everybody wanted to be superintendent in Chelsea." Taking advantage of an opportunity to run for mayor of Boston, Lam left Chelsea at what would become a critical point in the partnership's history.

At the time of Lam's resignation, Peter Greer was appointed Superintendent *ad interim* of the Chelsea schools. Serious concerns were expressed about Greer assuming this responsibility not only because of his often demonstrated top-down approach to dealing with issues in the Chelsea schools and community but also because he would obviously not have the distance from BU and supposed objectivity of an outsider like Lam.

There were indeed stylistic differences between Lam and Greer.[3] Whereas Lam spent considerable time and effort courting teachers, parents, and the broader Chelsea community, Greer was more absorbed in Chelsea's fiscal crisis and in figuring out how to keep the schools operating

---

[3] Those unacquainted with Lam and Greer question might whether their distinct management styles resulted more from the circumstances each encountered than from truly different approaches to running a school system. People who have worked with both of them, however, report repeatedly that the personalities and styles of the two superintendents were truly distinct.

with a significantly reduced staff and budget. Lam's Teacher Board (a voluntary group of teachers which met to discuss issues of concern), monthly teachers' coffees held in the superintendent's office, teacher newsletter (*Teachers and Teaching*), parent coffees, and parent newsletter (*Voyager III*) were all abandoned when Greer arrived. Despite their time consuming nature, these activities had been well received by the Chelsea community and helped to alleviate some concerns about changes occurring in the schools.

In fairness to Greer, however, it should be noted that the time and attention that he had to focus on fiscal problems would have forced most superintendents to eliminate some of Lam's outreach projects. And Greer did participate in outreach-oriented activities, although in a more indirect manner. Most notable among them was a weekly cable television program, "Let's Talk About Chelsea Education." This program was hosted by Greer himself and co-hosted by a Hispanic resident of the community, who translated the conversation into Spanish. However, many of these programs featured BU staff involved in the Chelsea-BU project and tended toward self-congratulatory praise. How many Chelsea residents actually watched this program is not known. Despite repeated pleas from Greer for viewers to send in questions, it was not until March 11 that a young student finally complied, and then only after Greer enticed viewers with the promise of a hamburger and fries!

Greer and Lam also oriented themselves differently toward their staff. Whereas Lam tended to be very responsive to teachers and their needs, Greer was far more oriented toward the principals. Almost all of the principals interviewed during Greer's superintendency noted this difference, and, not surprisingly, they noted this as one of the positive features of his brief stint in Chelsea.

With regard to the two superintendents' approaches to community relations, Peter Greer pointed to what he believed was another significant difference between Diana Lam and himself: "Lam is a woman and I am a man." To rescue Greer from coming across here as a chauvinist, however, it should be noted that his comment was limited to his perception of the superintendent's role as public relations representative for BU and did not necessarily extend to the position's administrative functions. According to Greer, Chelsea is a "macho" town, one in which the men, at least, can relate far better to a male than to a female superintendent. Greer perceived himself as being far better at communicating with the "man on the street" because of his gender.

The Chelsea community did not have much time to get used to Greer before he announced, in early February 1992, that he would be leaving after the completion of one school year. Even though he was appointed on a temporary basis, many believed that he would stay for two years. Following Greer's resignation BU conducted a nationwide search to replace him and hired John Gawrys, a superintendent with little experience in urban settings. The hiring process included community forums and provided an opportunity for Chelsea citizens to question the four candidates selected by BU as finalists. What became an issue, however, was not the candidates selected as finalists but rather the salary which was offered, $100,000. Although not out of line

with superintendent's salaries in other urban settings[4], this salary seemed extravagant to many in the Chelsea community. And for the first time since BU began managing the Chelsea schools, virtually the entire superintendent's salary would be paid by Chelsea. (BU had paid about 25 percent of Diana Lam's salary and all of Peter Greer's.)

With a commitment to remain in Chelsea for the duration of the ten-year partnership, Gawrys, whose tenure began in July 1992, has an opportunity to pull together the many diverse ideas, programs, and personalities that comprise the Chelsea-BU project. He also has the opportunity to provide Chelsea's educational system with the stability needed to move the partnership forward. However, his ability to grapple with the legacy left to him by his predecessors will also be critical to the partnership's future success.

Chelsea School Principals

Chelsea's school principals have been responsible for implementing incredible changes within their schools, ranging from a major structural reorganization of the grade levels served within the buildings to dramatic reductions in the number of teachers. At the same time, they have worked alongside several superintendents and have been faced with persistent shortages of supplies and other resources. Through it all, they have had the difficult task of ensuring that the city's students have the opportunity to learn.

The organization of the city's schools changed drastically during the 1991-92 school year. To accommodate a radically reduced teaching staff that resulted from cuts in the school budget, the middle school was eliminated between the second and third years of the project. The elementary school principals thus had to find room for several hundred students in schools that were already filled to their capacity. Burke Elementary School's student body, consisting of 278 students in the 1990-91 school year, increased by approximately 100 students in the fall of 1991 with the addition of grades six and seven to the small, pre-K-5 school; the principal of the Shurtleff School was confronted with similar changes as enrollment jumped from approximately 850 to over 1000 students with the addition of grades 6-8; and the Prattville School, with approximately 240 students in the 1990-91 school year, accommodated 50 additional students as it changed from a K-5 to a K-7 school. The principal at the Williams School was confronted with an even more complex situation when he had to transform a K-5 school with an attached but separate 6-7 middle school into a pre-K-8 school housing a wing solely dedicated to Chelsea's early childhood program. While restructuring Chelsea's K-8 educational system was part of BU's original plan, BU had not intended to make any structural changes until new school buildings were constructed.

At the same time, the high school principal implemented the second major structural change in Chelsea High School in three years — the high school was changed from a cluster of

---

[4] The average salary for school superintendents nationwide in 1991-92 was $83,342 (American Association of School Administrators). Presumably, the average salary in urban areas was higher. Many also receive extensive benefits such as cars and housing allowances, which is not the case in Chelsea.

"schools within a school" to a Copernican trimester system. The high school administrators favored this change and, citing reductions in discipline cases, suspensions, and the student failure rate at the high school, have indicated that the trimester system has "transformed Chelsea High School from one of failure to one of success." However, the extent to which these student outcomes can be attributed to the introduction of the trimester system or other educational initiatives is unclear.

For the principals, the challenge of school reorganization was exacerbated by a number of factors:

- The principals had only a limited amount of time to plan and execute the logistical changes.
- The turn-of-the-century school buildings were already operating at or beyond capacity, and many were suffering from severe structural damage.
- Increases in student enrollment at each school were accompanied by larger class sizes and reductions in the number of instructional staff.
- A percentage of the schools' original teaching staff did not hold the certification necessary to teach in an elementary school, resulting in the shift of some teachers across schools and/or across subject areas.

In addition, most of Chelsea's principals also faced a number of ongoing problems, such as the chronic lack of space and supplies, including textbooks and other instructional resources. In Burke Elementary School, for instance, lack of a permanent space for the art program resulted in the need for a portable program that ultimately reduced instructional time.

There has been significant turnover in Chelsea's administrators since BU began to manage the schools. New principals were hired at both Chelsea High School and Prattville Elementary School. While the high school principal was hired from outside the system, Prattville's principal was hired from within. In addition, Shurtleff School's current principal, previously the assistant principal for the school's K-2 classes, moved into the position during the 1991-92 school year to replace the previous principal who had assumed the position of Assistant Superintendent of Chelsea's schools. This turnover reflects an additional layer of change in Chelsea's educational environment.

As noted previously, the principals' sense of involvement in the Chelsea reform effort changed considerably with the change in superintendents from Lam to Greer. The Chelsea principals generally believed that Greer was far more accessible and responsive to their needs than was Lam. This sentiment prevailed despite the fact that the principals had minimal input into the organizational changes that were made in the schools over the summer between the second and third years.

On the whole, the schools' principals voice a general frustration about the financial constraints that have limited their ability to serve Chelsea's youth and to accommodate the needs

of its teachers. However, most of the principals have noted improvements from the second to third years of the partnership in their relationships with BU and with the BU-appointed superintendent. Although they disagreed with some of BU's decisions, on the whole they felt more comfortable with BU while Greer served as superintendent *ad interim*. They felt that Greer provided support to their activities, support they had felt unsure of before he moved from the Management Team to the superintendent's office.

Chelsea School Teachers

The closer one gets to the classroom, the more magnified the impact of fiscal uncertainty and organizational change becomes. As suggested by the teacher study (Kirshstein and Pelavin, 1992), teachers' attitudes toward BU and the partnership have been, at best, mixed. Changes made to their workplaces have affected all aspects of their work. Although teachers seem to have somewhat more favorable opinions of BU than they did at the time the teacher study was conducted, the instability and insecurity of their professional lives most certainly has an impact on how they perceive the partnership and its efforts. To be fair, however, it must be stated that, because teachers have had to endure numerous trials over the past three years, trials not necessarily attributable to BU's actions but to the city's financial crisis, their opinions can hardly be unbiased, and their first reactions to innovations may not be to recognize the long-term potential of these changes.

Because of its objective of introducing students to new or modified educational programs, BU has focused attention on professional development opportunities for teachers. BU faculty have provided workshops and have worked one-on-one with teachers interested in participating in professional development opportunities (e.g., in such areas as mathematics, reading, pre-K).

The reactions of Chelsea's teachers to the BU faculty who spent time working in the Chelsea schools were influenced by the commitment displayed by these faculty members during the first three years of the partnership. Initially, Chelsea's teachers tended to view BU faculty in the classrooms as an intrusion. Teachers have subsequently built personal and professional relationships with the faculty who spend time in the Chelsea schools and, while teachers' perceptions of BU may vary, individual BU faculty are perceived favorably.

Another change faced by Chelsea's teachers was the introduction of merit pay during year three (1991-92) of the partnership. The notion of a merit pay system, first introduced during the 1990-91 school year, was not widely accepted by Chelsea's teachers, who felt threatened by the system. There was additional apprehension as a result of the reassignment of numerous teachers due to the 1991-92 structural reorganization. The teachers' union representative has voiced concerns about basing merit pay judgments on comparisons of displaced teachers with teachers who have been teaching the same subject or at the same grade level for years.

As previously noted, the laying off of all Chelsea teachers between the second and third years of the Partnership created considerable tension among teachers. Even for those teachers who were eventually rehired, the fiscal crisis affected their professional lives on a daily basis. As a result of the structural changes introduced in all of Chelsea's public schools during the third year of the partnership, a number of teachers were placed in different schools, taught different age

groups of children, or taught different subjects than they had in the past. The structural transformation of the schools brought about changes in the certification status required by the newly created pre-K/K - 7/8 schools, and some teachers were shifted across schools and subject areas solely on the basis of their certification status. While these shifts may have been necessary, there were some difficulties. To illustrate, one elementary school received a new staff member who had formerly taught typing in the high school. Because this staff member had "general certification," she was placed in an elementary school in need of certified elementary school teachers. During the 1991-92 school year, the former typing teacher team-taught a self-contained class of 36 elementary school students.

Teachers at the high school faced similar disruptions at the beginning of the 1991-92 school year. The hasty introduction of the Copernican trimester system required quick adjustments on the parts of teachers, and their reinstatement only nine days prior to the opening of school gave teachers very little time to modify their course curricula to meet the demands of a trimester school year.

The Chelsea Teachers' Union

And what role has the Chelsea Teachers' Union played throughout the partnership to date? This is an intriguing question given that the driving force behind the Chelsea-BU project, John Silber, is well known for his strong anti-union stance? Indeed, Silber has gone so far as to state publicly that teachers' unions are the major impediment to educational reform in the United States.

Given this backdrop it is perhaps not surprising that the union's stance toward both Chelsea school administrators and BU has tended to be adversarial and hostile over the past three years. The relationship between BU and the teachers' union began with a lawsuit challenging the legality of the partnership itself. No decision had been reached three years after the suit was filed.

Hostility and mistrust between the union and BU have not diminished over the years. Since the inception of the partnership, the union has filed numerous grievances and complaints. During the third year, for example, approximately 55 grievances were leveled against BU, most of these dealing with the firing of teachers over the previous summer. The head of the union, whose wife was among those Chelsea teachers not rehired by BU for the 1991-92 school year, described a number of areas of concern that the union held. These included BU's interpretation of teacher certification requirements that excluded seventh and eighth grade teachers from working in K-8 self-contained classrooms; the placement of teachers into courses for which they were certified to teach (since they held general teaching certification) but had minimal, if any, actual experience teaching; and the introduction of a merit pay system for teachers.

Another example of the adversarial relationship between the union and key school system representatives was the general inability to resolve grievances at early stages of the official grievance process. The grievance process channeled complaints first to the principal, then to the superintendent and finally to the Management Team. Most grievances in Chelsea reached the Management Team.

It is difficult to determine, however, the extent to which teachers actually support the union and stand behind its positions. Chelsea administrators and BU claim that teachers generally do not support the union. However, most teachers are union members.

Certainly, the union has been vocal since the Chelsea-BU partnership began. Its numerous grievances against BU initiatives and policies reflect teachers' general distrust of BU and misgivings about the project itself. It is ironic, though, that the largest salary increase that Chelsea teachers had seen in many years — 26 percent during the first three years of the partnership — resulted from the direct intervention of BU. The teachers' union did not oppose this move.

The "Supporting Cast"

In addition to the Management Team, School Committee, superintendents, principals and teachers, several other groups and individuals have helped shape the Chelsea-BU partnership to varying degrees. Some of these groups, after three years, were still trying to determine what their role should be. Others have been created, like A Different September Foundation, as a response to needs identified as the partnership progressed. And still others have maintained a supportive presence throughout the course of the project. All of these groups are an important part of the first years of the Chelsea-BU story.

Chelsea Executive Advisory Committee

Mandated by the legal agreement between Chelsea and Boston University, the Chelsea Executive Advisory Committee (CEAC) was created as the official vehicle through which the Chelsea community could respond to and influence BU's efforts to reform the schools. Originally, CEAC included representatives from 15 community organizations (e.g., Chelsea Commission on Hispanic Affairs, Chelsea Human Services Collaborative, Chelsea Coalition for Quality Education) and community segments (e.g., elderly, African-American community). From its inception, CEAC has continuously struggled to define its role and to focus its attention on advising BU. During the first year of the project, bylaws were adopted to help clarify CEAC's role and BU's responsibilities to CEAC. Even so, internal conflicts and a precarious relationship with the Management Team continued to affect the advisory committee's effectiveness during its second and third years of operation.

Initially, CEAC mistrusted BU and doubted the extent to which its collective voice would actually inform and influence the educational decisions made by BU. An internal struggle between representatives who wanted to assume more than an advisory role and those who accepted the limited nature of CEAC's power has continued to plague the Committee. During the second year of the partnership, however, the relationship between CEAC and BU became more collaborative, and the Management Team began to present some of its ideas to CEAC for discussion. However, CEAC's primary function remained that of providing a forum for dissent, rather than an influential advisory panel.

CEAC encountered a number of difficulties during the fall of 1991 that precipitated what might be called an identity crisis. This crisis culminated in a meeting of the Committee in November 1991 in which participants questioned CEAC's continued existence. The crisis was not unexpected in light of the following circumstances:

- Improved communication between BU and the community during the third year of the partnership diminished CEAC's utility as an umbrella advisory committee. Community groups began to perceive that they had individual voices in education issues, and many no longer channelled their ideas or concerns through CEAC.

- Internal factionalism continued to undermine the effectiveness of CEAC. Some member agencies questioned the adequacy of CEAC's role as a reactive sounding board for BU's ideas and expressed the desire to advise BU proactively concerning a variety of educational topics. Some members became disenfranchised as a result of the lack of agreement over CEAC's role and the perception that CEAC was not spending much time dealing with educational issues.

- CEAC began to question its effectiveness as the "voice of the community" since its membership did not adequately represent key factions within the community, most particularly the Latino population. To illustrate, the original CEAC membership included the Commission on Hispanic Affairs and the Bilingual PAC, but these organizations did not actively participate in CEAC meetings or activities. The inability to attract Latino participants has been exacerbated by current rifts within the community's Latino population.

- CEAC's chairperson, Gwendolyn Tyre, abruptly resigned at the end of 1991. Susan Clark, executive director of Choice Thru Education, Inc., an alternative educational offering for pregnant and parenting teenagers, replaced Tyre as CEAC's acting director.

CEAC decided that it had a contractual obligation to continue to serve as an advisor to BU. In addition, members re-affirmed the Committee's role as an advisory body and became committed to broadening its membership. This re-affirmation resulted in the withdrawal of several participant agencies (e.g., the Parent Teacher Organization) because of their intentions to take on more active roles through direct contact with BU. In other cases, member agencies replaced non-participating representatives and affirmed their commitment to CEAC (e.g., the religious and elderly communities).

CEAC's renewed interest in working with BU was accompanied by the decision to allay any internal conflicts and work toward several immediate and long-term goals, including: (1) ensuring that the Chelsea School Department has a working budget; (2) convincing BU of the need to attend more to "regular" education issues (such as scheduling for seventh and eighth grade students), in addition to their interest in specialized programming (e.g., for early childhood); and (3) actively recruiting a diverse range of participants from the community. New recruits have included Latin American Festival, Inc. and Say Brother, Say Sister (an African-American organization), among others.

The Chelsea Oversight Panel

Established upon the request of then Governor Dukakis, the Chelsea Oversight Panel was created to monitor implementation of the Chelsea-BU agreement. Its purpose "was not to evaluate the merits of the agreement or the intended outcomes, but to focus on process, in order to ensure that the terms of the agreement were met and to provide a forum for the affected parties" (Pelavin, Siegel, and Kirshstein, 1991; p. 17). Composed of outside educators, legislators, and businessmen, the panel has met periodically throughout the partnership.

It is particularly difficult to assess what function this panel is serving. Described by some involved in the Chelsea-BU project as "one of the biggest wastes of taxpayers' money," the Panel is hampered in its work by its inability to get input from community members. Community groups that typically have representatives attend other educational forums, such as School Committee meetings and Management Team public meetings, for whatever reason, do not seem interested in attending the meetings, open to the public, convened by the Panel. At one of its meetings held at the end of the 1991-92 school year, only two or three representatives from the Chelsea community attended.

Irwin Blumer, Chair of the Oversight Panel and Superintendent of Schools in Newton, Massachusetts, claims that the Panel's lack of access to the Chelsea community was exacerbated by the fact that it had no support staff to assist Panel members in their work during the first three years of the partnership. In spring 1992, the Panel was granted a part-time staff person to coordinate Panel activities.

Given the many different groups, both official and unofficial, that are monitoring BU, it is easy to understand why many believe the Oversight Panel to be a redundancy. The state of Massachusetts, however, views this group as necessary to the official monitoring of a very unique project.

A Different September Foundation

In January of 1991, the Trustees of Boston University created A Different September Foundation, a private, not-for-profit entity, to solicit financial support for the Chelsea-BU partnership. As stated by its first president, Michael Sandler:

> The Foundation's purpose is to solicit and receive gifts, grants and pledges for education reform first in Chelsea and later in other troubled school systems where reforms pioneered in Chelsea are applicable. The Foundation also acts as a clearinghouse so that educators and reformers nationwide can benefit from the lessons and information gathered during the revitalization of Chelsea's schools.

Finding that it was more difficult to raise funds than was initially expected, BU channeled its fundraising efforts into a separate organization. With full-time staff, an organizational title that does not immediately identify itself with BU, and a not-for-profit designation, A Different September Foundation has enabled BU to reach foundations and private funders who had in the past eluded them.

As the primary fundraising agent for the Chelsea-BU partnership, A Different September Foundation has written approximately 75 percent of all of the partnership's grants since the Foundation was founded. Between January and June of 1991, the partnership raised over $1.8 million in gifts and pledges. Approximately $735,000 were cash receipts, $566,094 of which were obtained through the efforts of A Different September Foundation. All of these funds were channeled to Chelsea to support its educational programs.

During FY 1992, the partnership collected gifts and pledges totalling almost $1.3 million and raised almost $1.75 million in cash receipts. Of the cash receipts, more than $800,000 were raised by A Different September Foundation. It is interesting to note that gifts and pledges totalled more in 1990-91 than they did in 1991-92, suggesting that the partnership's anticipated future receipts from outside organizations are declining. Furthermore, given that A Different September Foundation began its efforts half way through FY 91 but at the beginning of FY 92, one might have expected a greater increase in cash receipts due to the Foundation's efforts than the one observed. However, it would be premature to assume that this decline represents a trend.

While the Foundation has solicited grants and donations for a variety of programs, its primary funding priority, identified by the BU Management Team and Superintendent *ad interim* Peter Greer, is the early learning initiative. Of funds raised in 1991-92, 65 percent went to early childhood programs and only 35 percent to other programs. In addition, many of the Foundation's publications highlight early learning activities.

A Different September Foundation appears to be more or less successfully tapping the funding sources necessary to support the partnership. It has received money from major corporations (e.g., Raytheon Company, IBM Corporation, Bank of Boston, Massport), foundations (e.g., RJR Nabisco Foundation, Davis Educational Foundation, Hyams Foundation, General Electric Foundation, Harrington Trust), and individual donors. Some, however, have questioned the fact that the Foundation has not been able to raise as much outside money as it had initially hoped. Difficulties in raising money from potential funders appear to result from their hesitancy to invest money in a city of Chelsea's well-publicized record of fiscal instability. A Foundation representative highlighted four major concerns that have accompanied rejections for funding:

- Questions about whether or not the Chelsea-BU partnership is a national model of reform;
- The fiscal uncertainty of Chelsea;
- A general decline in funds due to the recession; and
- Questions about the replicability of the Chelsea-BU project.

A Different September Foundation has also adopted numerous methods for disseminating information about itself and the Chelsea-BU project both nationally and locally. Dissemination techniques range from marketing brochures highlighting BU's major accomplishments within the Chelsea school system to distributing t-shirts with the Foundation's logo to local students. In addition, A Different September Foundation, in conjunction with local donor companies, provided

each Chelsea public school student, teacher, and school employee with a book bag filled with school supplies at the start of the 1991-92 school year. The Foundation also publishes a newsletter eight times a year that describes specific educational programs and their accomplishments and explores the ways in which teachers, parents, and funders are assisting in the reform of Chelsea's schools.

With support from the Achelis and Bodman Foundations, A Different September Foundation sponsored a national forum on urban school reform in New York City in May 1992. Attended by approximately 150 people, including many from BU and the Chelsea schools, this event featured a number of speakers who are directly involved or interested in educational reform. One purpose of this event was to bring the Chelsea-BU project to the attention of other funders; its effectiveness in this respect is, as of yet, difficult to assess.

To facilitate community involvement in the partnership, Allan Afrow, a graduate of the Chelsea schools, established the Friends of A Different September Foundation in February 1992. The Friends program is designed more as a program to rally the support of the community — to help community members feel that they have a stake in Chelsea's schools — than as a fundraising organization. A major initiative of the Friends program (in conjunction with A Different September Foundation) involved selling "stock" in the Chelsea schools to members of the Chelsea community, among others. Individuals contributing money to the partnership receive "shares" in the Chelsea Public Schools and membership in the Friends of A Different September Foundation.

Chelsea's Legislators in the State House and Senate

Although not members of any of the "official" entities responsible for managing the Chelsea schools, Chelsea's representatives in the Massachusetts State Senate and House of Representatives have made major contributions to the Chelsea schools and to the recent educational reform efforts. Throughout the three years of the partnership, Chelsea has been represented by two particularly influential men who have worked hard to bring extra state funds into the Chelsea schools. Chelsea's state senator, Thomas Birmingham, a Chelsea native and Harvard Law School graduate, has co-chaired the Committee on Education, Arts and Humanities for the past two years. State Representative Richard Voke has been in the House since 1976 and currently is the House Majority Leader. Both are known as champions of educational reform and have supported the Chelsea-BU partnership from its inception, working closely with BU to promote a number of important pieces of educational legislation.

As a direct result of Voke's and Birmingham's involvement, the state of Massachusetts has provided considerable funds to the Chelsea educational system over the past several years. In the fall of 1991, Chelsea received $1.5 million of $30 million allotted in statewide emergency educational assistance. This one-time payment to school systems in need was distributed based on a number of criteria (e.g., average class size, lack of instructional resources). These funds were distributed across Chelsea's elementary schools and used to purchase supplies and to replace textbooks that were often more than a decade old.

Interim funding was incorporated into the State's budget to provide $186 million in state funds for education during the 1992-93 school year. Chelsea is expected to receive approximately

$2.7 million of this money. Although this budget item was vetoed by the Governor, his veto was overridden by the State legislature. Both Voke and Birmingham supported this measure and lobbied to ensure that it would pass.

Senator Birmingham is also working with the Governor on a comprehensive, long-term educational reform package — the *Education Reform Act of 1992*. The package aims to minimize educational spending differentials across communities by way of a greater infusion of state funds. The Act sets a minimum for per pupil expenditures on education and includes the allocation of approximately $800 million in new state funding over a five-year period and new funding distribution formulae that will greatly benefit impoverished areas. This bill has not yet been passed and is not expected to affect students during the 1992-93 academic year. The specific effects this legislation will have on Chelsea, if passed, are unclear, except that Chelsea would certainly be a recipient of some additional funds, and the school district would benefit from some of the statewide reforms introduced by the legislation.

Chelsea's legislators not only support education but understand the city's long-term needs for economic growth and development. They have supported the inroads made by the receiver to relocate businesses and government agencies into Chelsea and have recognized that BU has attracted money to Chelsea that would not otherwise have been accessed. As evidence of Senator Birmingham's active support for communities like Chelsea, he introduced a lottery bill designed to equalize the return that these communities receive from the state lottery. Residents of Chelsea spend an average of $450 on lottery tickets per person per year, yet their return on this "investment" is only 26 percent of what they spend. That is, for every dollar spent in Chelsea on the lottery, only 26 cents returns to the community; by contrast, some communities receive $1.14 back for every dollar spent on a lottery ticket. Senator Birmingham's legislation will make returns to communities on lottery expenditures even at 29 cents on the dollar.

Chelsea's state legislators understand the community which they represent, and they have developed the influence and power needed to bring additional resources into the community. They are considered friends of the Chelsea-BU partnership and of education in Chelsea in general.

The Receiver

James Carlin, the state-appointed receiver for the city of Chelsea, assumed management of the ailing city in mid-September 1991. In early October of that year, Carlin appointed L. Harry Spence as deputy receiver. Immediately upon arrival, Carlin and Spence began to effect changes in all of the city's operational and fiscal systems, including those of the school department. Downsizing and fiscal restraint were imposed upon all of the city's departments, although the school department's budget was less severely cut than were the budgets of some of the other city departments, such as the police and fire departments. BU's continued management of the educational system had to be conducted within the financial boundaries set by the receiver.

The legislation establishing receivership for Chelsea provided for an appointed receiver for up to five years, subject to annual reappointments. Under the legislation, the position of mayor was eliminated and the receiver assumed all of the powers of that position. The receiver has the authority to:

- Hire and fire city personnel;
- Renegotiate union contracts;
- Raise city fees; and
- Overhaul the city's zoning regulations.

Technically, the receiver adds an additional bureaucratic layer to educational decision-making in Chelsea. Since the receiver has ultimate control of all educational decisions that have a fiscal impact, the Management Team (BU) is no longer able to steer singlehandedly Chelsea's educational reform movement. The effects of this diffusion of power have been twofold. While decision-making has become more cumbersome for BU because BU now must screen the budget and expenditures through the receiver, there have also been some positive effects. Notably, the installation of the receiver has deflected some of the criticisms and negative perceptions recently aimed at BU by the community, especially hostilities concerning budget cuts and staff firings. Furthermore, though the receiver has the power to make all budget and city personnel staffing decisions, outside of the budget arena Boston University has been left more or less alone to continue its educational restructuring efforts; given the egos involved, the relationship between the receiver's office and BU could have been far more tumultuous.

The receiver has also had a direct impact on the Chelsea School Committee. In order to reduce expenses, the remuneration of School Committee members and the number of committee meetings each year were both reduced.

Over the summer of 1992, Carlin left his post as receiver and in the fall, Spence was officially appointed to this post. Spence is likely to lend further stability to the relationship between BU and the receiver's office since he is a strong supporter of education and appears accessible to both BU and the Chelsea community. Both BU and Chelsea have indicated that the receivership will be advantageous to the city and, specifically, to Chelsea's schools because of the stability provided to Chelsea's meager school budget.

John Silber

It would be negligent to write a chapter on the key players and groups involved in educational reform in Chelsea without discussing the role played by John Silber, President of BU. John Silber conceived the Chelsea-BU project, and John Silber will do everything that he can to make sure that it succeeds, or, at least, to make sure that the project is perceived as a success.

Having served as President of BU for over 20 years, Silber demands and extracts loyalty from those with whom he works. Those who know Silber claim that he can be demanding, controlling, and intimidating at times. He has strong opinions which he is not afraid to voice in any forum.

Silber's view of the Chelsea-BU project is very telling. To him, participating in the project is a "civic responsibility." This sense of duty is what he believes should keep BU faculty

who are involved in the project from burning out, from quitting before their work is done. However, the fact that both Peter Greer and Ted Sharp, two prominent players in the BU-Chelsea partnership, left their partnership and BU posts at the end of partnership year three suggests that the devotion he exacts from his faculty might be difficult to sustain over long periods of time.

Interestingly, Silber has worked with his former gubernatorial opponent, Weld, to support legislation that would benefit the Chelsea schools and community. Silber supported the receivership legislation, and, despite some stories about power conflicts with Carlin, Silber has worked with the receiver's office on many different educational issues.

One can examine in the greatest of detail all of the official governance structures provided by the Chelsea-BU partnership, the educational goals guiding the reform effort, the programs implemented to attain these goals, and the unanticipated crises which have affected the project. But one cannot really grasp what is going on in Chelsea without some understanding of John Silber's ideas and style.

Summary

This chapter describes a large number of key players in the Chelsea-BU partnership. Some of these players, however, are more "key" than others. They wield more influence and work more directly to ensure that this unique effort persists in spite of the many crises and unanticipated events it has faced. Other players have struggled to define their roles and to make their opinions heard. In several cases, these struggles have yet to be successful. Groups such as the School Committee and CEAC have expressed concerns about their actual influence on BU and about their roles, both official and unofficial.

CHAPTER 3

The Transformation of the Chelsea Schools: Structural and Pedagogical Changes

Since the Chelsea schools opened under BU's management in the fall of 1989, many changes in the structure of the schools and in the way education is presented to students have occurred. Whether driven by educational philosophy, by space considerations, by economic necessity, or perhaps, by whim, these changes have caused Chelsea's principals, teachers, and students to alter their ways of teaching and learning.

Depending upon the grade level of the student, these many changes have meant different things. Some of Chelsea's students have experienced both structural and pedagogical changes almost annually. For example, eighth graders were moved into the high school and clustered during the middle of the first year of the partnership, the high school was divided into three "schools within a school" during the second year, and this organization was abandoned for a trimester system at the beginning of the third year. Thus, students in the ninth grade in 1989-90 may have spent that year in the traditional, semester-based school; their tenth-grade year in one of the "schools within a school;" and their eleventh-grade year adapting to the newly introduced Copernican trimester system. Rather than serving as a stronghold of stability and security where students can go about the business of learning, Chelsea's high school has essentially been a place of constant change and commotion.

In addition to the structural changes, fiscal crisis resulted in the elimination or downsizing of some fundamental courses (e.g., physical education, art, vocational education) traditionally enjoyed by Chelsea's middle and high school students. In the face of these cuts, BU significantly expanded its music program, a move that was criticized by many groups, including school administrators, members of the Chelsea School Committee, students, and the community.

Preschool students, on the other hand, have been the real beneficiaries of BU's involvement in the Chelsea schools. Three- and four-year-olds now attend classes on two of Chelsea's school campuses, and BU has established as one of its foremost goals the objective of providing all three- and four-year-olds with preschool education, either through its own programs or through other programs in the city. Chelsea's early childhood program has attracted national attention as columnists and educational reformers document its rapid growth and early successes.

Although very few criticize the quality and benefits of the early childhood program, many question BU's decision to expend such a high proportion of its resources in this area. Many have argued that BU has allowed middle school students, in particular, to flounder while providing a first class preschool program for Chelsea's youngest residents. Indeed, several sixth and seventh grade classes reached 45 students during the third year of the partnership. Despite BU's argument (which it is forced to make repeatedly) that education in Chelsea can best be improved by providing a strong foundation to young children before they reach school age, many question

whether an entire generation of older students should be sacrificed to an exemplary early childhood program.

This chapter examines the nature of structural and pedagogical changes and their effects on the Chelsea schools and their students. While it is important to understand exactly what the structural and organizational changes have brought to the Chelsea schools, educational change itself affects teachers, administrators, and students. Structural changes to schools thus must be considered in at least two lights. Each modification to a school's structure must be evaluated in terms of its impact on students and teachers. Also, given the sheer number of changes implemented, changes that repeatedly affect the same groups of students and teachers, the issue of change in and of itself must be considered beyond the positive or negative effects of any specific change.

Early Childhood Education

Early childhood education has occupied a central role in BU's efforts in Chelsea since the onset of the partnership. John Silber and the Management Team firmly believe that a solid early learning experience provides a much needed foundation for learning throughout an individual's life. Despite the numerous, and sometimes unanticipated, crises to which BU has had to respond and the resulting delays in implementing some of its proposed plans, the early childhood program has marched forward, serving more and more young children and their families each year. Although many in the Chelsea community have criticized BU for devoting too much of the city's limited resources to early childhood education, few criticize the philosophy behind the program or the quality of the program itself.

The first year of the partnership was spent planning for future years' activities in the area of early childhood education. Years two and three, however, witnessed the development and evolution of Chelsea's Early Childhood Program. At the beginning of year two, September 1990, the Early Learning Center opened on the campus of a Chelsea parochial school. The Center provided preschool education to 140 three- and four-year-olds and also served as headquarters for other early childhood projects begun during the year, including the Chelsea Home Instruction Program and the IBM High Technology Daycare Project.

Although the program got underway during year two, both John Silber and Management Team Chair Peter Greer were concerned about its quality and leadership. In particular, they questioned the suitability of the person Diana Lam chose to establish and run Chelsea's early childhood effort. Dr. Judy Schickedanz of BU's School of Education visited the Early Learning Center and was not pleased with what she saw as the program's lack of coherence. She began to take steps to develop both the curriculum and the staff, and with the assistance of Chelsea's administrators and pre-kindergarten and kindergarten teachers, she published a General Statement of Philosophy for the early childhood initiatives in the spring of 1991. Dr. Joan Ottinger became

the new director of the program in September 1991; at the same time the program was moved from the campus of the parochial school in which it had been housed to the Williams School.[1]

At the heart of Dr. Ottinger's philosophy of early childhood education is the belief that a strong teaching staff ensures a good educational program. She hired new teachers during year three, some of them replacements for teachers she believed incapable of adapting to the new agenda. Dr. Ottinger was assisted in her curriculum and staff development efforts by Dr. Schickedanz, and in August 1991, Dr. Schickedanz held a week-long curriculum workshop for 15 Chelsea early childhood teachers to prepare them for implementing the changes to be introduced to the program. During the workshop, the teachers developed a set of objectives for children in the program, aimed towards fulfilling the program's central mission: to ensure that all Chelsea children enter the first grade prepared to work at that level.

What BU is doing for young children through its early childhood program is certainly notable. Opportunities are being offered to these youngsters unlike any they would have without BU's involvement in the Chelsea schools. Indeed, such opportunities for pre-kindergarten education are not available to most children through the public schools. As previously noted, BU's critics do not question the importance of early childhood education or the quality of the program which BU is providing. Rather, they question the decision to devote so much of the school system's limited resources to a program that serves children who had not been included in the school system's population before BU arrived.

Chelsea's Elementary Schools

Chelsea's elementary school students have experienced a number of changes as a result of partnership activities. Specifically, the development and implementation of curriculum objectives for elementary grade students during the first and second years of the partnership and the restructuring of all of the elementary schools in the third year have, theoretically, created continuity and cohesion of purpose in the elementary schools.

BU targeted the development of curriculum objectives for grades K-8 as a key activity to be accomplished during year one of the partnership. As documented in our earlier report, the process of developing these objectives did not proceed smoothly. BU got off to a late start and developed curriculum objectives only for grades K-5 during the first year. Despite this rather shaky beginning, 28 of Chelsea's teachers participated in two-week training workshops in the summer between the first and second years of the project. These workshops were well received

[1]Given that BU believed that early childhood education was to be a cornerstone in the Chelsea reform effort, it is surprising John Silber and the Management Team did not get more involved in staffing and management issues until the end of the second year.

by the participating teachers and helped to alleviate some of the tensions that arose during the development process.[2]

During the second year of the partnership, the curriculum objectives were implemented in grades K through 5. The mathematics and science curricula were generally believed to be the most coherent of those developed, followed by reading and language. The development of objectives for social studies classes, however, got started much later and had not evolved as far as the objectives in other subject areas. Numerous workshops were held for elementary school teachers during the second school year of the partnership to reinforce the objectives and to train teachers in their use. One of the major stumbling blocks in using the objectives, however, was the lack of funds during the second year to purchase the textbooks that supported the new curriculum. Still, for the first time in years, a uniform, coherent curriculum was being taught to Chelsea students city wide.

Other curricular changes at the elementary level were brought about by financial necessity: programs in physical education and art were drastically reduced. However, substantial music curricula were developed and implemented during years two and three of the project.

The fiscal crisis that hit the city of Chelsea during 1991 wreaked havoc throughout the school system. Substantial budget cuts led to the redistribution of grade levels at all of the city's elementary schools. The Williams School, a K-5 school with an attached but separate 6-7 middle school in the 1990-91 school year became a pre-K-8 elementary school with a wing devoted to housing Chelsea's early childhood program the following year. In addition to the elimination of the middle school, the eighth grade classes housed in the high school during years one and two were re-incorporated into Chelsea's elementary schools. The resulting excess of students generated by these actions pressed the Williams, Prattville, Burke, and Shurtleff elementary schools to their physical limits. The closure of Saint Rose, one of Chelsea's parochial schools, at the end of the 1990-91 school year, further augmented the enrollment in Chelsea's public schools during this crucial time.

The changes brought 100 additional children to Williams School proper and approximately 250 students to the early childhood wing. Burke Elementary School's student body increased by approximately 100 students with the addition of grades six and seven to the small, pre-K-5 school; Shurtleff underwent similar changes as enrollment increased by 150 students with the addition of grades 6-8; and Prattville accommodated 50 additional students as it changed from a K-5 to K-7 school. Under the revised structure, seventh-grade students at two of the schools, Burke and Prattville, underwent an additional discontinuity in their educations, when they moved as eighth-grade students to spend one year at one of the other elementary schools.

---

[2]Initially, BU intended to train the "best" teachers to serve subsequently as mentors to colleagues in their schools. Because of problems associated with teachers' contract negotiations, this selection did not occur. The curriculum institutes were opened to all teachers, and mentoring opportunities were not widely pursued.

These transformations, carried out in a period of financial crisis, mimicked the vision BU had always had for the Chelsea schools: elimination of the middle school and transformation of the elementary schools into K-8 schools. However, BU wanted to implement the new structure after the construction of new school buildings that could comfortably accommodate students.

In addition to the curricular and structural changes detailed in the preceding section, BU has introduced other educational strategies that have altered the educational experience of selected elementary school students. To eliminate the need to remove students who received specialized or supplemental educational services (e.g., bilingual, special education, Chapter 1) from their classrooms, Chelsea's schools began to integrate this specialized instruction into the traditional classrooms. One way in which this has been accomplished involves the use of teaching teams comprised of a homeroom teacher and a Chapter 1 from their classrooms, special education, or other specialized teacher. To date, a student's exposure to integrated classrooms varies by school, with Prattville and Burke elementary schools still relying heavily on the "pull-out" approach.

Middle School Education in Chelsea

The students most significantly affected by the almost yearly restructuring of the elementary schools have been Chelsea's middle school students. Eighth graders and their teachers moved from the Williams Middle School to the high school in the middle of year one and back to two of the elementary schools at the beginning of year three. Sixth and seventh graders were also reshuffled at the beginning of year three with the imposition of the new structure described above.

During year one, Williams Middle School was restructured into a number of clusters or small schools. Initially, clustering included both heterogeneous and homogeneous ability groupings of students; some clusters separated high achievers from other students. (For details on year one middle school clustering, see Pelavin, Siegel, and Kirshstein, 1991, p. 38.) During year two, however, students of all ability levels were grouped into heterogeneous clusters. In addition, bilingual students and students with special needs were integrated within all classrooms. There were two integrated special education/regular education clusters (one in the sixth grade and one in the seventh), one multilingual cluster, and five additional clusters. Chapter 1 teachers were assigned to the eight clusters, and Chapter 1 students were served within the clusters.

Because clustering was originally introduced without any accompanying staff development or training, middle school teachers did not widely accept it during year one. Teachers became considerably more satisfied with clustering during year two, due largely to the following factors:

- During the summer of 1990, selected teachers were given the opportunity to participate in a Cluster Planning Institute and to refine the cluster model for the 1990-91 school year.

- Common planning time for teachers within clusters was expanded from two times to three times each week to afford teachers greater opportunity to discuss

individual student needs, plan interdisciplinary activities, and share ideas and teaching approaches.

- Teachers simply became increasingly accustomed to the notion and practice of clustering.

However, though not formally eliminated, clustering became impractical during year three. The Williams School Headmaster identified some of the obstacles to maintaining clustering during that year of upheaval including increased class sizes and the eradication of common planning time. The decision to cluster was left to individual teachers, and, during year three, only eighth-grade teachers, now teaching at two of the elementary schools, retained clustering.

Given that sixth, seventh, and eighth graders experienced the least continuity and predictability of school structure, cohesive curriculum objectives could have potentially reduced some of the disruption. However, sixth- through eighth-grade curriculum objectives were not developed until year two, and their implementation was left for year three, a year in which structural changes were likely to mask any impact of improvements in curricula.

Middle school students and teachers experienced virtually no continuity in the first three years of the partnership. They have been shuffled and reshuffled across schools, they have been clustered and unclustered, and their classes have grown and grown. On numerous occasions throughout the duration of the partnership, the Chelsea community has expressed concerns about the quality and stability of education being offered to middle school students. Even in an ideal environment, adolescence can be unsettling — a time in which youth encounter numerous biological, emotional, and social changes. The precarious situation in which Chelsea's youth find themselves during their early teenage years can only be exacerbated by the myriad educational changes they have encountered in their schools.

Chelsea High School

Chelsea High School has also undergone a series of reorganizations since the inception of the partnership. Additionally, it has experienced a number of changes in administration, including a turnover in principals between the first and second years of the partnership, several changes in the assistant principals, and changes in the persons directing a number of key programs (e.g., dropout prevention). All of these changes, whether in the way the school is organized or in the persons staffing key positions, affect the flow of education to students.

As described above, during the middle of the first year of the partnership, eighth grade students were moved from the middle school to the high school and clustered in a wing of the high school. During year two, clustering was expanded to include ninth grade students as well. Prior to the third year of the partnership, Chelsea's eighth grade students were removed from the high school and accommodated in Chelsea's already overcrowded elementary schools.

The year two transformation of the high school initially included the creation of three "schools within a school" for tenth through twelfth graders (the eighth and ninth graders being clustered separately within the school). The "schools within a school" were designed to personalize the high school experience and to engage students and teachers in close working relationships. Planning activities in year one set the stage for the establishment of these schools during the second year:

- The Renaissance School served 126 students, mostly high achievers, in grades 10, 11, and 12. Based upon the principles of the Sizer and Cologne, Germany models, the Renaissance School offered an integrated, interdisciplinary approach to learning and challenged students to achieve by providing individualized student programs and by adopting the philosophy that students are workers and teachers are coaches. The Renaissance School utilized a flexible "Copernican" scheduling style with double length periods and incorporated cooperative learning, problem solving, and critical thinking skills into its interdisciplinary curriculum.

- The Voyager Academy served 23 students above the age of 18, including seven former drop-outs, eight former bilingual, and four former special education students. The alternative education program emphasized team-building, internships, and individual learning contracts. While not operational during year three of the partnership due to budgetary constraints, the remaining Voyager students received assistance and support from the Pathway School (a drop-out prevention effort introduced at Chelsea High School during year three).

- The Traditional School served the remaining 900+ students enrolled in the high school in grades 10, 11, and 12.

Despite the fact that the Renaissance School and Voyager Academy were widely hailed for their innovative approaches and their attempts to break the high school experience into smaller, more personally meaningful programs, a relatively small percentage of students were actually able to take advantage of these two approaches. Only 14 percent of all students enrolled in Chelsea High School during the 1990-91 school year were enrolled in either the Renaissance School or the Voyager Academy.

These programs were short-lived. Only one year after their year two debut, BU was forced to eliminate the "schools within the school," not because of any perceived problems with the programs, but because of the city's fiscal crisis and resulting reduction in teaching staff. The high school administrators, along with Superintendent *ad interim* Peter Greer, had to think quickly and creatively to devise a way to run the high school with about 25 percent fewer teachers. The resulting plan for restructuring was adopted without input from teachers. In the fall of 1991, those teachers who had been rehired for the school year arrived at Chelsea High School to face yet another major change to the structure of their school, the Copernican trimester system.

According to those who implemented the system in Chelsea, a trimester approach allows a school to operate with fewer teachers since fewer courses are offered at any one time. In the trimester system adopted in Chelsea for the 1991-92 school year, students generally took nine

courses over a year's time — three courses in each of three trimesters — and teachers taught only two courses each trimester. During the first year the system was implemented, the high school offered approximately 300 classes over the school year. While a trimester system increases the duration of individual class sessions, there is also a decrease in the total time teachers spend teaching a given course. Thus, teachers must cover material in a shorter period of time.

Reactions to the trimester plan after its first year were mixed. Administrators, including the superintendent, the high school principal, and the assistant principals praised the merits of the system. Proponents of the plan also noted that the trimester system reduced class sizes and decreased the failure rate from 50 to approximately 24 percent. Furthermore, average student attendance increased approximately six percent after the adoption of the trimester system. These encouraging developments led André Ravenelle, the assistant principal at the high school who helped design and implement the effort, to say, "It transformed Chelsea High School from one of failure to one of success." The effects of the trimester system were not universally positive, however. To illustrate, the Scholastic Aptitude Test scores of Chelsea's seniors, which had steadily increased since the inception of the partnership, plummeted during the 1991-92 school year, the same year that the trimester system was adopted at the high school.

However, not all teachers and students reacted positively to the change. Teachers did not receive training before they were thrust into the trimester system, despite the fact that high school administrators had requested that BU delay the opening of the high school an additional two to three days so that teachers could get the appropriate training. Although a three-hour seminar was provided to teachers each month to help them learn to teach within the structure of a trimester system, a number of teachers still had not adjusted to the system by the end of the school year. Some teachers felt a strong need to modify the approach so that selected courses (e.g., U.S. history, biology, geometry) could be extended across several trimesters, a recommendation that was to be implemented for a few core courses in the 1992-93 school year.

Students were also mixed in their reactions to this change. According to key Chelsea High School administrators, many students found it boring to stay in the same class for 90 minutes every day. On the other hand, other students recognized that a "boring" class lasted only a third of the year, rather than half a school year. Students thus generally saw the opportunity to start new courses more frequently as an advantage of the system.

Chelsea's Copernican trimester system has attracted the attention of numerous schools and educators nationwide. During the 1991-92 school year, Chelsea High School hosted representatives from eight schools across the country interested in adopting the trimester system locally. In addition, André Ravenelle was invited to visit a school in Nova Scotia that was interested in instituting a trimester system. Despite mixed reactions among those most influenced by Chelsea's trimester system, the schedule, adopted in the eleventh hour, has rapidly become a model for other educators.

According to Ravenelle, the third year of the partnership saw a "trinity of structural changes" at the high school. In addition to the trimester system, Chelsea High School introduced two other key programs that affected the structure of education, the Pathway School and Dreams and Plans. The Pathway School, located on the High School campus, was an alternative school

for students who had not succeeded in the "traditional" school setting; it served 32 students during the 1991-92 school year. The Dreams and Plans program, a multi-faceted dropout prevention initiative, was introduced to approximately 150 students in 12 ninth-grade homeroom classes during the 1991-92 school year and is expected to expand to include all ninth-grade homerooms. Unlike the trimester system, these programs do not reach all of Chelsea's high school students.

What appears to be missing from the continuous activity in the high school is the development and introduction of new, cohesive curricula to support the myriad changes faced by the students. Not until year three of the partnership were curriculum objectives in mathematics, science, history, and English developed for the high school and, by the end of the school year, they had not been implemented. There are many explanations given by BU for the delay in the development of curriculum objectives, a delay of two years from BU's original goal of developing curriculum objectives for all grade levels by the end of year one. The city's fiscal crisis and the limited participation of BU faculty members in the development of these objectives are two of the most common explanations. But, one must ask, where has the lack of coherent curricula left Chelsea's high school students? Without the benefit of improved curriculum provided by coherent objectives, it is conceivable that Chelsea High students who graduate during the earlier years of the ten year partnership will place little value on the many changes made by BU in the high school's educational structure.

Staff Development Activities

Even the smallest of changes in the way education is provided to students can require a major reorientation for teachers. The reform effort in Chelsea can in no way be described as small, nor can the impact of the many structural and organizational changes on both students and teachers be ignored. Furthermore, the turnover in superintendents, with their different personalities and styles, and the financial setbacks that forced changes and/or reductions in staff, school structures, and programs only intensified teacher anxiety and increased the need for in-service training opportunities.

Additional circumstances made staff development activities in Chelsea all the more important. Chelsea teachers, many of whom had been teaching in the system for more than 10 years, did not initially welcome BU in its new role. A threat of a teachers' strike and a lawsuit brought by the teachers' union and supported by Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers, are suggestive of the hostility with which teachers viewed BU. Their initial resistance was not diminished by the strain to the system caused by the city's subsequent financial crises.

These circumstances have made staff development efforts both a sensitive and an important undertaking, for even the most ambitious of plans to improve educational systems can readily be thwarted by teachers who resist proposed changes. While BU has introduced a considerable amount of staff development, there is no question: more would have been better.

Most staff development activities have involved the direct participation of professors from BU's School of Education. These activities have included institutes, workshops, seminars, and opportunities to enroll in BU courses. Reactions to the professional development opportunities provided by BU to teachers are almost universally positive.

During each summer of the partnership, BU has offered curriculum institutes to various segments of the Chelsea teacher community. In August 1990, before the beginning of year two of the partnership, BU sponsored week-long curriculum institutes in reading, social studies, and science for elementary school teachers. The institutes provided the 28 participating teachers with opportunities both to respond to the pre-K through fifth-grade curriculum objectives and guides developed over the previous year and to learn how to implement the new curricula in their classrooms. Teachers responded positively to these institutes.

The week-long summer institute held in August 1991 focused on early childhood education. Despite the fact that they did not even know if they would be rehired for the 1991-92 school year, 15 pre-kindergarten and kindergarten teachers attended the workshops organized by Judy Schickedanz. Again, the teachers reviewed curriculum objectives developed during the prior school year and discussed how they would be implemented.

BU has also provided tuition scholarships to Chelsea teachers who wished to continue their educations at the university. Up to eight teachers each semester could take any four-credit course offered at BU. Scholarship recipients were selected by the Chelsea School Superintendent's office. Since the beginning of the partnership, BU has provided 55 tuition scholarships to Chelsea teachers and administrators.

Ongoing staff development is provided by BU professors who work with small groups of Chelsea teachers. Over the course of the 1991-92 school year, Professor Suzanne Chapin worked with about a dozen elementary school teachers, showing them innovative ways of teaching concepts to students. She emphasized using hands on materials to supplement textbooks. Drs. Jeanne Paratore and Lee Indrisano also conducted reading workshops for teachers, and Peter Greer brought in an outside expert to give teachers a workshop on how to teach geography to fourth- through eighth-graders. In addition, a course using The Skillful Teacher text by Sapphier was offered throughout years two and three to both elementary and secondary teachers and administrators. According to the principal of Chelsea High School, by the end of year three approximately half of all high school teachers had gone through the course. It was meant to be a "refresher" course for experienced teachers and to encourage them to try new activities with their students. Teachers who participated in the course said that the peer observation component, in which a teacher watches a colleague teach and provides comments, was especially useful. The Sapphier Course was funded by an outside grant.

One final form of staff development activity, which has taken root independent of BU, is workshops put on by teachers for other teachers. Most notable have been the workshops for science teachers. The "leaders" among the science teachers received Title Two grants during 1990-91 for science professional development and were paid to act as coordinators to provide other teachers with access to science kits.

Staff development activities, however, decreased in number in 1991-92 despite the fact that the year was, by far, the most tumultuous of the first three years of the project. High school teachers in particular could have benefitted from staff training prior to entering the classroom to teach under a trimester system. Although administrators at the high school had requested an additional two to three day delay in opening the high school so that teachers could receive some training, this request was denied. Furthermore, many of the training activities initiated in year two, including classroom demonstrations and after school workshops, were scaled down or eliminated in year three. Some of this reduction must be attributed to the budget cuts mandated by the receivership. However, some of this reduction in activity also could have resulted from "burn-out" on the part of BU professors. Professors from BU who provide staff development activities to Chelsea teachers do so above and beyond their regular duties at the university; these duties are not reduced to accommodate their work in Chelsea.

It is the case, however, that teachers who have worked with BU faculty are much more positive about BU's presence in Chelsea than teachers who have not. In a survey of teachers conducted during the second year of the partnership, teachers' participation in BU-sponsored activities greatly increased their perceptions of BU's impact on the Chelsea schools. "Whereas 83 percent of the teachers who took part in 3 or more activities indicated that BU had improved the Chelsea schools, only 29 percent of teachers who had not participated in any activity thought this to be the case." (Kirshstein and Pelavin, 1992; p. 9). Thus, staff development activities appear not only to help teachers do their jobs better but also to "bring them aboard the BU bandwagon."

The training that BU has provided to Chelsea teachers appears to have been well received by teachers and administrators alike. All agree, however, that considerably more is needed.

Conclusion

The system-wide restructuring of Chelsea's schools has been both beneficial and problematic. Adopting a K-8 system minimizes student movement across schools and provides students with a sense of stability. Additionally, high school administrators attribute increased teacher and student expectations to the introduction of the trimester system.

But rapid structural transformations have brought a host of difficulties to Chelsea's schools. Changes in teacher certification requirements in the elementary schools have resulted in the reassignment of teachers across schools and subject areas, and both students and teachers have been moved between schools as budgets have gotten tighter. By rapidly introducing the modifications described throughout this chapter, BU has left the teaching staff little time to modify course curricula and otherwise prepare to meet the demands of the changing instructional environment. As one school administrator put it, managing the changes themselves is really a half-time job in and of itself.

Many of the changes introduced into the Chelsea school system during the first three years of the partnership have been beneficial. In fact, the early childhood program has provided Chelsea's youngsters with several new learning opportunities not available three years ago. Even the rapid flow of change and innovation in the high school appears finally to have abated, and, as the dust settles, what is left is a structural system that holds promise for Chelsea's secondary students.

Despite the strong and negative reactions to the first three years' extent and pace of change, the long term potential of these changes is, overall, viewed favorably by many of Chelsea's educators and community members, as well as by outside observers. Perhaps during partnership year four, Chelsea's schools will have the energy and resources necessary to develop and expand those innovations that seem to work, without the ball and chain of fiscal crisis and instability to slow their efforts.

CHAPTER 4

In the Name of Educational Reform: Programs and Activities

Many programs and activities were initiated during the first year of the Chelsea-BU agreement to support the reform of Chelsea's educational system. Despite systemwide school restructuring, fiscal setbacks, and staff turnover, most of these programs continued during the second and third years of the partnership. Some programs even expanded and a few new initiatives appeared on the scene in the midst of major budget and program cuts in the third year. In particular, a major BU-sponsored music program that reached all Chelsea students became one of the key program initiatives of the 1991-92 school year. Although some in the Chelsea community questioned BU's use of extremely limited resources, very few questioned the quality of the music program and the enthusiasm with which students embraced it.

This chapter describes the major programs and activities that characterized the second and third years of the Chelsea-BU project. Although the governance issues, personalities, and fiscal crises have tended to attract more attention than the programs themselves, school reform in Chelsea has indeed included several major innovations that affect students and staff at all levels.

Early Childhood Programs

As has been previously documented in this report, BU has channeled much of its energy and resources into its early child education programs. The various programs administered under its early childhood project have grown almost exponentially each year of the partnership, and they have repeatedly been lauded by insiders and outsiders alike for the opportunities they are providing for Chelsea's young children.

The Early Learning Center

The Early Learning Center (ELC) opened at the beginning of the 1990-91 school year on the campus of Our Lady of Grace, a parochial school in the Chelsea community. Eighteen teachers and paraprofessionals taught 140 three- and four-year-olds. The program fully integrated special needs students, and two ELC classrooms offered a two-way bilingual program.

In the fall, children received weekly art classes presented by A Very Special Artists Residency, and in the spring, outside consultants provided them with movement classes. They also were paired with "reading buddies," older students at Our Lady of Grace, who read on a weekly basis to ELC students. Students from Chelsea High Schools' Voyager Academy also worked with ELC students.

Newsletters, notices of upcoming events, and children's composition books were regularly sent home to parents. Over the course of the 1990-91 school year the Center held four special

events, including a Thanksgiving celebration and an international dinner, to which parents were invited; between 21 and 62 parents attended each of these events. Individual classrooms also often invited parents to join in classroom activities.

In the Fall of 1991 with its new director, Dr. Joan Ottinger, the program moved into a wing of the Williams Elementary School (with two additional classes at the Burke School), thereby placing the children in a school where many would remain throughout their elementary education. During the 1991-92 school year, a total of eight classrooms at the Williams and Burke Schools taught three- and four-year-olds from 8:15 to 2:15 each day. All classes were integrated, serving special needs children alongside children without special needs. The "two-way bilingual program" allows children from Spanish- and English-speaking backgrounds to play and work together and to learn each other's language. Also, in order to better serve working parents, three classrooms at the Williams School offered extended day classes until 6:00 p.m., and one classroom opened at 7:30 each morning. The program attempted to provide one teacher and one teacher's aide for every 15 students. In all, 255 preschoolers have been served by Chelsea's preschool program since 1989.

Kindergarten Classrooms

The Early Childhood Program supports kindergarten instruction as well. A total of 17 classrooms at Chelsea's four elementary schools averaged one teacher and one teacher's aide for every 25 students in the 1991-92 school year. Four of the kindergarten classrooms were bilingual, teaching all students both in English and in Spanish, Vietnamese, or Khmer. The kindergarten program at the Williams School also offers an extended day program.

Chelsea Home Instruction Program

The Chelsea Home Instruction Program (CHIP), adapted from a successful program in Israel, helps parents to develop their children's learning skills and instill in them an excitement about learning. Visiting home instructors provide parents with activity kits of basic learning materials (a book is included in every "CHIP box" and is the springboard for the week's activities) and one-on-one instruction in how to use them. The instructors visit weekly and describe projects for parents and children to do together, such as enjoying a book, reading and preparing a simple recipe, or drawing and listing everything in the home that is of a particular shape. Each CHIP activity helps parents develop their children's skills in language, sorting, classifying, problem solving, and sensory discrimination. Parents attend workshops to help them understand the principles that underlie the project. The program is offered in English, Spanish, Vietnamese, and Khmer; the eight home instructors also speak these languages (three English, three Spanish, one Vietnamese, and one Khmer). CHIP, like the Early Learning Center, has grown significantly since its inception, reaching 60 families in 1990-91 and 120 families in 1991-92.

High Technology Home Daycare Project

The High Technology Home Daycare Project, funded entirely by IBM, was implemented in the middle of partnership year two. The project has two components. Its primary component uses an IBM-funded computer network to link family daycare providers with educational resources outside their homes and with each other. The network supplies up-to-date information to six home childcare providers, serving 42 children, about a wide variety of subjects, including nutrition and safety, relevant community programs and activities, and educational play activities appropriate for young children. Daycare personnel are trained in educational methods, child development, and computer literacy. The daycare providers communicate via computer modem with advisors at BU's School of Education and Sargent College of Allied Health Professions, as well as the Chelsea School Department, Massachusetts General Hospital/Chelsea Memorial Health Center, and other Chelsea childcare agencies. The project has trained staff from all childcare organizations in Chelsea.

The Project also offers free training workshops to parents and other daycare providers on how to read with children, work on pre-math skills, and develop science activities. As of the end of the third year of the Chelsea-BU project, about 90 parents, childcare workers, and volunteers had participated in these training sessions.

Future Goals for Early Childhood Education

In April 1991, the Management Team created the Early Childhood Task Force to analyze the barriers that existed in the early childhood education system and to create a coordinated program of various options to enable parents to choose the program that would best suit their needs. Members of the Task Force included representatives of the Management Team, the Chelsea School Department, private non-profit program directors, the Chelsea Executive Advisory Committee, and other Chelsea organizations with a stake in early childhood education. In March 1992, the Task Force submitted its recommendations in a document entitled "Access and Options." This "statement of objectives" sets out the goal of providing every three- and four-year-old child in Chelsea with the opportunity of participating in a preschool program every work day of the year. The children would be served either through the public schools or through existent private, non-profit preschool programs.

Attainment of this lofty goal would require classrooms and funds not currently available. BU estimated the number of unserved three- and four-year-old children in Chelsea to be about 530 as of May 1992 and that only half of them would take advantage of the cost-free program if it were available. As the authors of "Access and Options" envision the development of the program, 180 additional children could be served by the public schools and 64 could be served by the existent private, non-profit agencies, Head Start, and home day care programs; they estimated the cost of providing educational programs to these 244 unserved children to be $2.8 million annually. How close BU and Chelsea might come to attaining this goal remains to be seen.

Adult Education

BU's activities in the area of adult education have, to date, been limited in nature. One program, the Intergenerational Literacy Project, comprises the virtual entirety of BU's efforts. This program, however, is widely acknowledged to be exemplary. BU also provides some support to the adult basic education program that has existed in Chelsea for approximately two decades but has yet to make any major contributions to the program.

The Intergenerational Literacy Project

BU's comprehensive approach to school reform reaches groups not traditionally served by the Chelsea public schools, including preschool-aged children and parents and grandparents. Considered by many experts in the field of adult education to be a model program, BU's Intergenerational Literacy Project, under the direction of Dr. Jeanne Paratore, a member of BU's School of Education, predates the actual signing of the agreement. In operation since February 1989, the Intergenerational Literacy Project has expanded under the partnership, serving 66 families in the 1989-90 school year but over 180 in 1991-92.

The idea underlying the Intergenerational Literacy Project is that improving the literacy of parents and grandparents will lead to the enhancement of their children's language arts skills. Furthermore, parents and other adult family members feel more motivated to learn to read when they have children to read to. Adult participants thus learn to read using books that they can then read to their children. In addition, while adults attend classes, BU students provide child care to participants' children, reading stories to them and working with them on other pre-literacy skills.

Three times during the year — fall, winter, and spring — the Project offers eight-week sessions for marginally literate parents and others who care for children under the age of ten. Nearly 70 percent of the students in the project are Hispanic, and 20 percent are Southeast Asian. Classes meet Monday through Thursday, and both day and evening sessions are offered. BU reports attendance to be fairly high, around 70 percent. In addition, a literacy tutoring seminar, staffed by former intergenerational literacy students, is held one evening a week during the academic year.

Participants are not tested formally, but in order to graduate, adults must attend at least 75 percent of the classes, engage in class activities, and provide evidence that they read and write to their children. They are encouraged to attend multiple sessions and, in fact, approximately 90 percent of the participants remain in the program for an additional cycle. Funding comes from several sources, including the U.S. Department of Education, the Massachusetts Department of Education, the Xerox Corporation, the Ratchesky Foundation, the Chelsea Public School Voyager Grant Program, and private donors.

Adult Basic Education

Another element of adult education in Chelsea has operated since 1975, long before the partnership between BU and Chelsea was conceived. The city's Adult Basic Education program

(ABE), which receives funding from both the city and the state, served over 300 students, ranging in age from 16 to 85, during the 1991-92 school year. The ABE program offers courses ranging from basic literacy instruction to GED preparation. In 1990, English as a Second Language instruction was eliminated because of statewide budget cuts.

Although the ABE program had functioned independently prior to the partnership, the current state grant requires that BU officially run the program. Dr. Jeanne Paratore has assumed responsibility for writing the program's grant applications and administers the program's funds. Barbara Evans, who has served as Director of the ABE program for the past 14 years, continues to conduct ABE classes and complete all reporting requirements and sends periodic program updates to Dr. Paratore.

BU had initially stated its intention of becoming more active in the ABE program, but, according to Ms. Evans, the Management Team found more than enough to keep it busy at the schools and, as of the end of the third year, had not directed its efforts to ABE.

The Music Program

In the midst of deep budget cuts, teacher layoffs, and the elimination of a number of courses and programs, music emerged during the third year of the partnership as one of BU's primary focuses. Instrumental instruction, a school chorus, and musical enrichment activities all flourished during the 1991-92 school year in Chelsea. Although teachers and administrators alike criticized the resources provided for what they considered a "frill" at a time when class sizes were growing and teachers were conducting classes without adequate instructional materials, BU pressed on and developed a first class music program. BU took the position that a comprehensive, well planned music program could provide all of Chelsea's students with a positive educational experience and, at the same time, introduce activities that would facilitate cooperative learning, competition, self-discipline, increased self-esteem, and responsibility, among other skills — intangible skills and traits that are vital to the ultimate development and success of each student. In addition, these and other skills are developed within a framework that is familiar, and important, to many students — music.

Under the leadership of Dr. Richard Colwell, Chairman of BU's Music Education Department, the music program in the Chelsea schools is all encompassing. Dr. Colwell began his efforts in the schools in the Fall of 1990. Before BU initiated changes, the music program was floundering with no particular objectives and little attention. During year two, Dr. Colwell established regular musical instruction periods and brought in BU students to assist the existing music staff in instruction.

Most of the substantive changes to the program occurred in year three, when new teachers were hired, curricula and objectives were developed, and the structure of music classes became regular. A music instructor at the Early Childhood Program is assisted by Boston University students in 30-minute music sessions twice a week; classroom teachers in the Early Childhood Program are expected to provide additional musical instruction.

In grades 1 through 8, students received 45-minute music lessons twice each week. Instrumental music was offered through a twice-weekly, 30-minute pull-out program for fourth through eighth graders. Four days a week there was an after-school program at each elementary school offering lessons in guitar, recorder, chorus, keyboard, and band. An all city elementary school chorus, called The Chelsea Singers, was also established and rehearsed twice a week after school; the chorus's first concert, televised by New England Television, was attended by many parents and Chelsea residents.

At the Williams and Shurtleff schools, piano laboratories have been set up, and children and parents learn to play together. The program has also solicited donations of instruments to supplement those already in the schools' possessions.

BU envisions the music program as a source of continuity in the lives of Chelsea children. The children are likely to be taught by the same teachers, who travel from school to school, from the fourth through the twelfth grades. They further believe that this continuity allows for the infusion of facets of BU's philosophy of education, namely that application leads to success and that schooling and education are not synonymous. Furthermore, participation in after-school music programs is contingent upon attendance; thus the appeal of the music program to children is intended to increase the daily attendance rate.

By the end of year three, Dr. Colwell and his teachers were compiling a detailed set of curriculum objectives for music instruction in grades K through 12; these objectives are both ambitious and prolifically documented. They encompass both behavioral standards and musical achievement. Dr. Colwell and the teachers emphasize commitment and responsibility above all. They stress that membership is a privilege, not a right. Students who do not attend rehearsals regularly are dropped from their bands or choruses. Children who play instruments pay a $20 yearly fee, $10 of which is reimbursed if the instrument is in good shape at the end of the year.

The dual emphases of musical achievement and earned membership might raise some eyebrows, especially in light of the fact that the musical program offered in the schools represents the only access most of these children have to musical education. Students of lesser musical ability might still be willing to apply themselves, for instance, to the demands of the Chelsea Singers, for which children must audition. Furthermore, BU's decision to make music education a high priority has also raised eyebrows, both inside and outside Chelsea. Chelsea's music program surpasses that in many other public and private school systems around the country, systems which are far better funded and which have far fewer academic and social problems.[1] These criticisms must be tempered, however, by the realization that BU's music program aspires to reach beyond "programs and performances" and thus to serve an integral role in the development of basic, vital skills.

---

[1] Considering instruction time alone, the 90 minutes of music instruction Chelsea's first through eighth graders receive each week exceeds the national average by approximately 50 percent (Charles Leonhard, The Status of Arts Education in American Public Schools, Urbana, IL: Council for Research in Music Education, 1991).

Dropout Prevention Activities

Chelsea's students have one of the highest dropout rates in the state of Massachusetts. More than half of the students who were in the eighth grade in Chelsea in 1983 never graduated. From the very beginning of the partnership, BU recognized the severity of Chelsea's dropout problem and adopted as one of its 17 original goals to "decrease the dropout rate for students in the school system." BU has responded unyieldingly to this mandate by developing a comprehensive, multi-faceted dropout prevention initiative geared mainly toward the high school. Its response has included a number of different initiatives that incorporate efforts to track and monitor the attendance of all students as well as the implementation of specialized programs such as Voyager Academy, Chelsea Futures, Pathways, Digital Mentoring, Dreams & Plans, and other crisis prevention activities. These many programs are coordinated by a dropout prevention director who is responsible for monitoring students at-risk of dropping out and for streamlining the various dropout prevention activities. This position was held for the first two and a half years of the partnership by a woman with years of service to the Chelsea community and, since February 1992, by a woman who taught science at Chelsea High School for 15 years.

Tracking and Monitoring Dropouts

In response to its serious dropout problem, Chelsea High School began to systematically monitor the attendance and related behaviors of at-risk students during year two of the Chelsea-BU agreement. Attendance records were computerized during that year, and the dropout prevention coordinator, assisted by a "case manager," began tracking chronic absentees as potential dropouts. After five absences, the student's parents were notified, and an outreach worker visited the home to discuss the child's absences. After 15 absences, a conference was generally held with the student and his/her parents. In 1991-92 the coordinator also worked with two parent liaisons who each worked at the school 15 hours a week. Their primary role was to serve as liaisons to the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) and to keep parents informed about dropout prevention programs. The director of dropout prevention also assembled small groups of students throughout the year to discuss the dropout issue.

The computerization of attendance records closed some of the cracks through which students could fall. No longer did students' absences go unnoticed. Nor were students going to leave the high school without a major effort on the part of staff to bring them back into the system.

Chelsea Futures

The Chelsea Futures project existed prior to the beginning of the Chelsea-BU partnership. The project attempted to reduce the incidence of dropping out through two mechanisms: case management and tutoring. During the first year of the partnership, four case managers "stayed on top of kids" who were at-risk of dropping out. During year two, the case management staff was reduced to one. Using failure of two courses in a semester as an indicator of students at-risk of dropping out, the program also aimed to prevent students from dropping out by providing them

with one-on-one academic tutoring. Tutors were volunteers from the community. The Chelsea Futures project lost its funding and was abandoned after year two. However, with the establishment of computerized attendance data, the growth of BU's tutoring project in the Chelsea schools, and the restructuring of the high school to the Copernican system at the beginning of year three, the Futures program became somewhat redundant.

Voyager Academy

The primary focus of Chelsea's dropout prevention activities has been the creation of special programs to meet the varied needs of students who are considered at-risk of dropping out. While a number of innovative programs were developed during years one and two, there has been little continuity from year to year. The Voyager Academy, one of the "schools within a school" at Chelsea High School during the second year of the partnership, was headed by Maggie Lodge, a special needs teacher at Chelsea High School. The program provided an alternative educational program for 23 over-age students, including former drop-outs. The program incorporated team-building, internships, and individual learning contracts into its high school curriculum. Physical education took on the form of rowing sessions in Boston Harbor; the Voyager Rowing Team won some races. Voyager students also successfully completed course work at Boston University and Bunker Hill Community College. This program was eliminated prior to the 1991-92 school year as the Copernican trimester system replaced Chelsea High School's multi-school model.

High Expectations Learning Program

The High Expectations Learning Program (HELP) is the only dropout prevention effort that has been in existence continually since the first year of the partnership. HELP offers extra summer courses for students who need extra credits to graduate or to be promoted. Approximately 180 students took advantage of the program during the 1991-92 school year; most students took HELP courses in order to make up credits not earned during the school year while some students took the courses as educational enrichment. Teachers are encouraged to teach courses on topics of particular interest to them; teachers who participate in the HELP program are paid an hourly wage for their extra work. Examples of recent course topics include the documentary film; the writing of Robert Cormier; the history of race, class, and gender; and SAT preparation.

The Pathway School

At the end of the second year of the partnership, Chelsea High School received a three year grant from the RJR Nabisco Foundation to create the Pathway School. This grant, written by Diana Lam and her assistant, Meg Campbell, provided $704,550 to the high school to set up an alternative school for students who either had already dropped out of school or were at-risk of doing so. The grant was one of 15 winning grants submitted to RJR Nabisco's Next Century Schools program; Next Century Schools looks for proposals that attempt radical change in education. Winning the grant was, in the words of Peter Greer, "a feather in the cap of the people who run the Chelsea schools."

On October 15, 1991, the Pathway After School Program opened its doors to provide an after-hours, non-traditional path to high school graduation. Although the program had the capacity to serve 50 students during the 1991-92 school year, 32 students actually enrolled in Pathway in its first year. Participants were largely Hispanic males. Students were interviewed before being admitted to the program, and they had to demonstrate motivation and commitment to return to school in order to be admitted.

The Pathway School, in many respects, picks up where the Voyager Academy left off. Indeed, several students who had been in the Voyager Academy transferred into Pathway after the elimination of the Academy. Maggie Lodge headed both the Voyager Academy and the Pathway School, and the two alternative programs thus shared an educational philosophy. One important difference between the two programs, however, was their hours of operation. While the Voyager Academy operated during regular school hours, Pathway operated from 2:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. on Mondays through Thursdays and 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Fridays, making it more accessible to students with work or family responsibilities. Friday activities are experiential in nature and include rowing in the harbor (another carry over from the Voyager Academy) and performing Shakespeare through a theater-residency with the Roxbury Outreach Shakespeare Experience. The multi-faceted program includes:

- A teacher/advisor for each Pathway student.
- A "significant adult" in each student's life who provides support to the student and reinforces the "home, student, school triad."
- HELP academic courses. The first two hours of each academic day are devoted to HELP courses, which are available to students in the regular high school as well, either as enrichment or as make up. HELP was incorporated into the proposal that resulted in the RJR Nabisco funding of Pathway and is now administered under the Pathway School.
- Interdisciplinary courses.
- Structured study time during which students work on required projects.
- A cooperative group supper four nights each week that both students and staff were required to prepare and attend.
- On-site self-help and support groups and community meetings. Students may discuss particular achievements, problems, or their outside school activities, as they choose, during these sessions.
- Internships and other work experiences. Students receive academic credit rather than monetary compensation for their work. Examples of internships students have held include working in the offices of state representatives, the Massachusetts Children's Legislative Caucus, public television station WGBH, Centro Hispano, the Digital Corporation, and Reaching Out to Chelsea Adolescents.

Three teachers, Maggie Lodge, Mary Driscoll, and June Murray, instructed students in basic education skills, including mathematics, reading, and ESL. All three teachers have experience with alternative teaching methods and have worked with at-risk students in the past.

At the end of the 1991-92 school year, five members of the first Pathway class graduated from Chelsea High School. Of the five, two are now employed full time, one by an urban service program. One has entered a training program in office management. One has entered Brandeis University's Transitional Year Program, and the other has been accepted by Northeastern University.

Dreams and Plans

Another component of Chelsea's dropout prevention initiative is the Dreams and Plans program, funded in the fall of 1991 by a three-year, $350,000 Boston Foundation grant. This program aims to keep students in school by averting potential crises. The program is run by a director and two outreach workers and has three components:

- **An advisor/advisee program.** This program component provided 12 ninth-grade homeroom teachers during the 1991-92 school year with the professional development opportunities necessary to acquire outreach skills. Each teacher/advisor assumes direct responsibility for a group of students, interacts regularly with them, and develops a comfortable rapport. As a result, teachers become people whom students feel they can turn to in times of trouble.

- **Outreach and crisis intervention.** Two certified counselors provide outreach and case management services to students, and the families of students, who are not attending school. The counselors also provide guidance to the teacher/advisors, when needed.

- **Life skills curriculum.** This comprehensive curriculum focuses on issues such as substance and drug abuse, AIDS, decision-making, values, violence, and relationships with families, school, and partners.

About 150 students received some type of service through Dreams and Plans during the 1991-92 school year. Future plans include expansion of the advisor/advisee program to include all ninth-grade homerooms.

The Digital Mentoring Program

The Digital mentoring program, funded and implemented by the Digital Corporation, matches Digital employees with Chelsea students. In 1990-91 approximately a dozen Chelsea juniors were paired with Digital employees, and in 1991-92 ninth graders were added to the program. Digital provides transportation to the students and offers career awareness workshops. The program is similar to a "big brother/big sister" program. Pairs meet at least every other week; activities they have engaged in include going to watch the Red Sox play, going to the

theater, and working on research projects together. There are also occasional activities for all pairs to participate in together.

Digital staff also became involved in the Pathway School during the 1991-92 school year. They presented a training workshop to 15 Pathway "significant adults" and staff members in connection of the Pathway objective of ensuring that every student has one adult mentor in his or her life.

Digital's commitment to Chelsea runs only through April of partnership year four. However, the students involved who were juniors in 1990-91 have since graduated, and no new students were added to the program at the beginning of year four. Thus the future of the program is unclear.

The Boston University School of Social Work

BU's most direct involvement in the area of dropout prevention is through the daily presence of the School of Social Work in the high school. Dr. Maria Meyer, Assistant Professor in BU's School of Social Work, coordinates a crisis prevention counseling program on the campus of the high school and works closely with staff of all of the high school's dropout programs. She and her graduate student interns offer crisis prevention workshops as well as one-to-one counseling. Although her activities are not confined to dropout prevention, they often assume that focus.

Tutoring Program

The BU Tutoring Program matches BU students, faculty, and staff with Chelsea students in need of additional academic assistance. The program was initiated during the first year of the partnership but had very little success due to lack of participation on the part of BU students. In the 1990-91 school year the program was improved, and consequently expanded, by BU's introduction of shuttle bus service between BU and Chelsea for tutors. However, it still met with considerable criticism from Chelsea administrators, teachers, and tutors alike, who complained of substantial communication problems and high absentee rates on the parts of both students and tutors. Year three appears to have been a turning point; the program seemed to be better organized and as a result, received generally favorable comments from all groups involved.

During the program's first two years, the BU Tutoring Program relied primarily upon volunteer tutors and donated materials, but in 1991-92, the Santa Claus Anonymous Foundation pledged a grant that has provided and will continue to provide instructional materials to the program. During year one of the partnership, fewer than 32 tutors from BU participated in the program. The program grew significantly during year two when 122 tutors served approximately 130 Chelsea students. In year three of the partnership, 120 tutors from BU served more than 100 Chelsea students. Both elementary and secondary students from all five schools in the district received tutoring. The high school tutoring program was overseen by a director who was on-site during peak tutoring times — 2:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday

evenings. At all grade levels, most of the tutoring provided was in the subjects of English, reading, and mathematics; at the high school level, the English and reading tutoring typically included English as a Second Language instruction. The tutors maintained "tutoring logs" that described their experiences with their students. The log books were intended to be a mechanism to provide feedback to Chelsea teachers.

By at least one account, the program appeared to be successful: at the high school level, 88 percent of students receiving tutoring completed the courses for which they were receiving assistance with grades of C or better; 37 percent earned As and 18 percent earned Bs. At the elementary level, 50 percent of the students tutored improved by at least one grade and 28 percent remained the same or had mixed improvement over the course of three terms.

In the spring of 1992, the director of the tutoring program, a BU faculty member, administered a survey to gauge teachers', administrators', and tutors' perceptions of the program's effectiveness. Teachers indicated that they had seen differences in the attitudes and performances of their students who were receiving tutoring. Their academic performances, including comprehension of course content and completion of assignments, had improved, as had their attitudes toward learning and their participation in class. However, many teachers indicated they were not aware of the logs maintained by the tutors, and consequently were often unfamiliar with the nature of the help students were receiving. Administrators had similar comments about the program, and both teachers and administrators indicated that tutor dependability had increased greatly from the 1990-91 school year. Tutors, in turn, said that student attendance was also generally consistent, again a marked improvement from the program's first year of operation.

Future goals for the program include continued improvement of communication between teachers and tutors and the appointment of a Chelsea faculty member as a school-based coordinator at each school. The coordinator, paid for by BU, would be responsible for informing tutors when children were absent, keeping the program director at BU informed of absences on the part of unreliable tutors and making sure that teachers see the tutoring log books. More attention will be devoted to securing additional funding, which could support salaries for the teacher coordinators and purchase additional instructional materials. (During the past year the coordinating role was assumed by the principals, who found they did not have enough time to devote to organizing the program.) The program also plans to develop a manual of policies and procedures for tutors and school personnel to be published at the beginning of 1992-93. Finally, increased parental involvement is also a goal for the program during year four of the partnership.

Special Needs Populations

Historically, Chelsea's schools have tracked and sorted students according to their special needs. This is especially important in light of the fact that a higher percentage of Chelsea students are typically identified as having special needs than similar communities, or statewide. Special needs students include those who qualify for Chapter 1, special education, or bilingual education services.

Chelsea has tended to place these students in substantially separate programs more often than is practiced in similar communities. Recognizing the need for greater flexibility in regular education programs to serve these students, Diana Lam backed by Boston University, pledged to eliminate the practice and to enhance the integration of all students in Chelsea's schools. Team teaching, in which regular classroom teachers are paired with special needs' teachers to instruct a group of regular and special needs' students, was pilot tested in selected classrooms.

The successful integration of Chelsea's special needs students into regular classrooms has varied according to the specific needs of the students. When budget cuts challenged Boston University and school system personnel to restructure Chelsea's schools, those integration efforts that were not well-established — such as the integration of special education students — suffered set-backs. The following section describes the three program offerings for special needs students and the extent to which these students have been successfully integrated into Chelsea's regular classroom activities.

Chapter 1 Program

A large number of Chelsea's public and parochial school students, approximately 1000 students, qualify for Chapter 1 services. Typically, Chapter 1 is implemented as a "pull out" program in which eligible students are taken from their classrooms to receive supplemental instruction in one of several areas (e.g., ESL, reading, mathematics). The Chelsea school system has begun to take steps to reduce, with the ultimate goal of eliminating, the practice of pulling students out of their regular classroom activities to receive Chapter 1 instruction.

The Shurtleff and Williams Schools have broken away from the pull-out approach and have begun to adopt different models for delivering Chapter 1 services. These two schools have qualified as school-wide Chapter 1 programs and, in year two, their students comprised over 50 percent of the Chapter 1 population in Chelsea. Every child in the Shurtleff and Williams Schools has access to Chapter 1 services, and, with the elimination of pull-outs at these schools, many of these services have been integrated into the traditional classroom. During year two, Shurtleff created teaching teams (consisting of a homeroom teacher and a Chapter 1, special education, or other specialized teacher) to teach jointly a two hour fifteen minute basic skills concentration that included instruction in reading, language arts, and mathematics. Although students still received the basic skills concentration during year three, the session was shorter and did not include instruction in mathematics. Williams School fully integrated Chapter 1 students into its language arts curriculum.

Several of Chelsea's public schools (Prattville School, Burke School, and Chelsea High School) continue to rely on the pull-out approach to service delivery. At these schools, small groups of students received Chapter 1 instruction in separate classrooms for approximately 30 to 40 minutes each day. Many of the Chapter 1 teachers at these schools have received training in such practices as team teaching, but any efforts to adopt team teaching in regular classrooms, thus eliminating pull-outs, are informal and rely on the receptivity of the regular classroom teacher.

BU's most direct involvement in the Chapter 1 program has been through the provision of professional development for Chapter 1 teachers. BU faculty members have sponsored workshops

and in-class learning activities for teachers interested in such topics as co-teaching and integrated literacy. To illustrate the success of these efforts, several of Chelsea's Chapter 1 teachers presented their model of co-teaching at a state-wide professional conference.

Staff turnover, the fiscal crisis faced by Chelsea during the summer of 1991, and the resulting reorganization of Chelsea's schools all had a direct impact on the Chapter 1 program during year three of the partnership. There was a turnover of Chapter 1 directors between years two and three and Janis Rennie, a veteran of the Chelsea school system who had held numerous administrative positions within the schools, became Acting Director in the Fall of 1991. In addition to the backlog of work that awaited her, the Acting Chapter 1 Director was faced with an onerous task — making Chapter 1 services available to Chelsea's youth in the face of competing demands.

As a result of the restructuring, there were shortages of Chapter 1 staff since, during teacher recall time, a number of qualified Chapter 1 teachers were assigned to teach regular reading classes. Depending upon their assignments, these teachers were no longer in a position to team teach with traditional classroom teachers in Shurtleff and Williams Schools or provide pull-out services in Prattville, Burke, or Chelsea High School. In addition, student movement across schools affected the distribution of students eligible for Chapter 1 services. The Acting Chapter 1 Director had to rewrite the city's Chapter 1 grant while, at the same time, ensure that students received services. Finally, as a further result of the redistribution of students caused by the structural reorganization of schools, Burke School also qualified as a school-wide Chapter 1 program for the 1992-93 school year.

Chelsea's public schools have made some progress towards eliminating the practice of pulling students out of the classrooms to receive Chapter 1 services. The introduction of team teaching in some of Chelsea's public schools and opportunities for professional development for Chapter 1 teachers are illustrative of these efforts. However, Chelsea schools are still a long way from achieving their goal of integrating all students into regular classrooms and, more specifically, ensuring the provision of Chapter 1 services within the regular classroom setting. A number of Chelsea's public schools still rely heavily on the practice of pulling students out to receive Chapter 1 services. Additionally, staff development activities that focus on integration and co-teaching have traditionally been geared towards Chapter 1 teachers. Additional professional development, both for Chapter 1 teachers and their regular education counterparts, may help to familiarize teachers with the techniques and benefits of an integrated approach and to facilitate their embracement of the effort.

Bilingual Education

Close to 70 percent of Chelsea children are non-native English speakers, and approximately 800 students (30 percent of all Chelsea students) are enrolled in bilingual classes each year. Bilingual education in Chelsea serves children from grades K through 12. Although BU has introduced innovations in Chelsea's bilingual programs, bilingual education remains a point of conflict between BU and the community. The goal of bilingual education, by Massachusetts law, is the transitioning of children into "regular," monolingual (English) classrooms. John Silber and Peter Greer, among others, believe that this mandate is best complied

with by making the primary goal of bilingual education to teach students English, not to educate children in their native language and to teach them English only as a "side show." Many members of the Chelsea community, most vocally the Spanish-speaking community, oppose this view of bilingual education and want their children to learn English but not "lose" their fluency in Spanish.

At the Early Childhood Program at the Williams School, two of the eight kindergarten classrooms are bilingual, one in Spanish and one in Vietnamese. Two of the kindergarten classrooms at the Shurtleff school are also bilingual, again one Spanish bilingual class and one Khmer. In addition, the Chelsea Home Instruction Program (CHIP) is offered in Spanish, Vietnamese, and Khmer, as well as in English.

At the first through eighth grade levels, some bilingual classrooms have recently been transformed into what Chelsea calls its bilingual integration program. While many students remain in self-contained bilingual classrooms, others now learn in team-taught multilingual classrooms where native English, Spanish, Vietnamese, Khmer and other language speakers are mixed together. During year two, there were two-way bilingual programs in the fifth and sixth grades at Williams School. At Shurtleff, there were six classrooms involved in bilingual integration. Team teachers generally work in groups of three, one of whom is a bilingual Spanish speaker. Students are grouped by ability for subjects such as mathematics, and non-English speaking newcomers are assisted by children who speak their own language but have been learning English longer. Dr. Maria Brisk of BU's School of Education has provided some staff development activities and some guidance to the bilingual teachers at the elementary level, though teachers report that she was more involved in 1990-91 than in 1991-92. With budget cuts, the bilingual integration program was eliminated during year three.

At the beginning of the 1991-92 school year, the bilingual program at Chelsea High School was streamlined. There has been an increased emphasis on the English as a Second Language (ESL) program. Fifteen-year-olds entering American schools for the first time have different needs from five- or six-year-olds in the same position, since the coursework of older students assumes English literacy and the activities tackled by younger children do not necessarily require such literacy. Thus command of English is more crucial to integration into English-taught classrooms at t e high school level than it is at the elementary level. Integration of students into classes taught in English is expected, again by Massachusetts law, to take no longer than three years.

Typically, the school acquires about 100 new non-English speaking students each year, most of whom arrive during the first several weeks of school. Under the direction of a "teacher-in-charge" (due to budget cuts, the position of bilingual coordinator was eliminated at the beginning of the 1991-92 school year and replaced by two teachers-in-charge, one at the elementary level and one at the secondary level), Chelsea High set up a Newcomers Program for recent immigrants that included both an extensive introduction to the school and testing of students' capabilities in English and in their native languages. The Newcomers Program's orientation period lasts for about two weeks, after which time students are transitioned into ESL classes appropriate for their language levels and other classes, which may be taught in English or in their native languages (Spanish and Vietnamese). In 1991-92, biology, pre-algebra, U.S.

history, and civics were all taught in Spanish and Vietnamese as well as in English; chemistry was offered in Spanish and general science in Vietnamese. As their capabilities in English increase, students are transitioned to classes taught in English, but they are expected to come back to the Newcomers staff for any additional help they might need.

Special Education Program

The plan to enhance the integration of students in Chelsea's schools also included attention to students eligible for special education services. As was the case with Chapter 1 services, the plan for integrating Chelsea's special education students relied upon making more special education services available within the regular classroom. While the nature of special education placements depends upon the results of the initial screening and evaluation, there are two predominant categories of placements — within the regular school campus or in separate facilities (including day schools, residential facilities, and homebound and hospital environments). What differentiates those students receiving services on a regular school campus is the amount of time they spend out of the regular classroom setting receiving special education services.

Most of Chelsea's special education students are served on a regular school campus. Of the 694 students receiving some type of special education services during year three, 85 percent received services on the campus of one of Chelsea's public schools. Thirty-seven percent of those students receiving services on campus received special education and related services for less than 25 percent of the school day. These students received the majority of their education in a regular class. In addition, 37 percent of those students receiving special education services on campus received the majority of their education in self-contained, special classrooms made up entirely of children in need of special education.

Shurtleff School has been in the forefront of Chelsea's integration activities. During year two, Shurtleff created teaching teams that included a homeroom teacher and a special education or other specialized teacher. These teams taught a basic skills concentration to all students, including special education students who had been integrated into the regular classroom for this activity. The teams made decisions about who needed the specialized services of a resource room (this room was also integrated as it included special needs children and new students who needed some additional assistance). Integration also became more widespread in the middle school. The team-teaching approach had a number of additional consequences, including minimizing: the need to pull out students to receive services, the amount of referrals to special education, and the labelling of teachers (e.g., special education versus regular classroom teachers).

The momentum of integration activities was lost during year three, in large part due to budget cuts during years two and three. In April of 1991, the position of Director of Special Education was eliminated and individual school principals took over the administration of the special education program. The restructuring of Chelsea's schools during year three further set back integration efforts. Teachers who had built a relationship as part of a team during year two were often separated. And teachers, overwhelmed with increased class sizes, were less willing to accept special needs students in their regular classes. As a result, the decision was made to rely more heavily on the traditional special education model and students were again pulled out regularly to receive services or even placed in separate classrooms.

Year three was spent regaining control of the special education program. In August of 1991, Carol Murphy was appointed as Assistant Superintendent for Special Services. This position represented a consolidation of the responsibilities of the former Directors of Special Education and Bilingual Education, both eliminated due to budget cuts. Murphy's primary activities during year three centered around streamlining special education, a high budget program. The per-pupil expenditure for special education in 1991-92 was higher than for any other program: $6960 per special education student (including students within the regular school campus and those in separate facilities), $4310 per full-time regular education student, and $2,238 per full-time bilingual education student. By streamlining special education procedures, Murphy eliminated $600,000 in special education costs during year three.

Special education teachers participated with other teachers in staff development efforts geared towards team-teaching and integrated literacy. During year three, approximately 10 slots were funded for special education teachers interested in attending workshops on integrated literacy. Pre-referral teams were also developed during year three in most of the Chelsea schools to gather information on students who may be in need of special services. While the integration of special education students experienced a major backslide during year three, the idea of integrating all of Chelsea's special needs students has not been discarded.

Health and Human Services Activities

The sometimes overwhelming health and social service needs of Chelsea students have always been recognized by BU. The extremely high teenage pregnancy rate, the myriad health and dental problems of Chelsea students, and the prevalence of alcohol and drug use among youngsters are but a few of the problems affecting attempts to educate students in Chelsea. BU's approach to addressing these many problems could be described as holistic; it is an approach that views learning within the context of a child's diverse needs and experiences. Sandra Kranz, Director of Extra-Mural Programs at BU's Goldman School of Graduate Dentistry explains BU's commitment to health and human service programs by noting, "[John] Silber knows that kids can't learn when in pain."

BU has initiated a large number of activities to address the many health and social problems of Chelsea students. These range from a health clinic located in Chelsea High School to a dental screening program to a number of social work initiatives in the high school. In addition, the Chelsea Health and Human Services Council and the Human Services Collaborative function as mechanisms through which community input is received and health and social service providers coordinate services. Although it might be said that it is in the area of health and human services that BU has had the most success working with the community, forming partnerships and collaborations, BU has its critics here as well. BU is often accused of "missing the boat," misunderstanding the community it is supposed to serve. For example, one Chelsea administrator criticized BU's year two decision to eliminate the positions of two guidance counselors and a school psychologist, a decision that disrupted children's lives and the services provided to them. Even BU's detractors, however, do acknowledge that BU is hardly responsible for Chelsea's

social problems and that the Management Team is attempting to respond to them despite the limited resources at its disposal.

Regardless of whether or not one believes BU has accomplished enough in the area of health and human services, the services BU provides and coordinates in Chelsea are extensive. BU has maintained an administrative position within the schools to oversee the many programs. Denise Hurley, Director of Human Services and Substance Abuse Programs during year three, has served in this position since BU began its work in Chelsea. (She had a similar role in Chelsea prior to the onset of the partnership.) Although her title has changed from Director of Human Services in year two to Director of Human Services and Substance Abuse Programs in year three, her primary responsibilities have remained fairly constant. (However, her work was disrupted in April 1991 when BU temporarily eliminated her position and made her a school psychologist. She was reinstated in her usual role in June 1991.) Hurley notes that her position is "100 percent substance abuse and 100 percent human services." In addition to maintaining an active role in health and human services activities, she supervises school personnel, including crisis counselors and elementary school counselors; she also addresses the issue of teen pregnancy.

Chelsea High School Health Clinic

The Chelsea High School Health Clinic is far and away the most notable among the health programs established. The health clinic, run by the Massachusetts General Hospital/Chelsea Memorial Health Center, in cooperation with Boston University's School of Public Health, opened in September 1990. The health center is intended to provide comprehensive medical care to all Chelsea High School students; it received start-up funding from the J. M. Foundation and a grant from the Jessie Ball DuPont Religious, Charitable and Educational Fund. Enrollment in the Student Health Center requires parental consent and, while students will not be turned away for lack of payment, the Center accepts all major insurance policies, including Medicare, which does, in fact, provide a major source of payment for services.

While the school has a nurse on staff to provide limited health services that are typically provided to all students in a school (e.g., vision and hearing tests, immunization reviews), the Health Center provides primary care, counseling, and referrals for all medical and psychological needs to students enrolled in the center's health clinic. The clinic is staffed by a certified nurse practitioner who offers medical aid to students and a clinical practice assistant who provides office support.

In the 1991-92 school year, about one-quarter of the student body took advantage of the health services offered by the clinic. After a number of delays resulting from the need to comply with fire department and handicap accessibility regulations, the health clinic finally obtained a license from the Massachusetts Department of Public Health to move into its permanent, more spacious site within the high school. However, the expanded facility did not become operational until the beginning of the 1992-93 school year.

A major focus of the clinic is the needs of new immigrant students, who often have special health problems. To attract non-English speaking immigrant students, informational brochures have been published in several languages, including Spanish, Khmer, and Vietnamese.

The clinic was at the center of one of Chelsea's biggest controversies during the 1991-92 school year — the debate over whether or not the clinic should distribute condoms to Chelsea High students. The Management Team rejected a proposal to distribute condoms through the clinic and the School Committee, with widespread community support, overrode the decision. Interestingly, it is not clear that the Management Team even had the authority to make such a decision since the Health Center is privately licensed and operated.

The Dentistry Program

The Dentistry Program began screening Chelsea elementary school students in April 1991. Chelsea dentists and dental assistants, in conjunction with the BU Goldman School of Graduate Dentistry, provided dental screening to all Chelsea kindergarten through eighth grade students. In the 1991-92 school year, 2301 students, 85 percent of all K-8 children, were screened (the remainder either were absent during the screening days or their parents refused to let them participate). Screening included not only the identification of dental problems but also basic dental hygiene instruction. The examiners identified 293 children, or 13 percent of those examined, in need of further dental treatment. Now that initial screenings have taken place, in future years the program will screen all children enrolled in the early childhood program (pre-K through K) and older students in alternate grades — first, third, fifth, and seventh.

Although the BU administrator responsible for coordinating the program would like to expand the program into the high school, it is not clear when and if that will actually happen.

Health Issues Curricula

Chelsea has channeled much effort toward the development of health curricula, including substance abuse, AIDS, and a comprehensive health education curriculum. During the 1990-91 school year, Chelsea adopted the Texas Substance Abuse Curriculum, which has been received more or less favorably. The K-12 thematic curriculum includes such topics as self-esteem and decision-making, tobacco/marijuana, and alcohol. One hundred twenty teachers, or about two-thirds of all Chelsea teachers, were trained to use the new curriculum during year three. While most of the curriculum is geared toward K-12 students, there are exceptions; for instance, the materials associated with marijuana are limited to grades 4-12.

During year two, Chelsea also began to review the health and AIDS curricula adopted by other school districts within the state with the goal of implementing a comprehensive health education curriculum by Fall 1992. In addition, the Management Team, when it voted down the motion to allow the Health Clinic to distribute condoms, reaffirmed its support for the development of a comprehensive health education curriculum. By the end of the 1991-92 school year, a draft of the curriculum's goals and objectives had been circulated to key individuals for review. This review continued during year four and, as a result, the health education curriculum had not been implemented in the schools by the middle of the 1992-93 school year.

AIDS Programs

The Chelsea community has been active in developing AIDS programs geared toward both students and the general population. Despite BU's stand against distributing condoms in the high school, BU has also initiated programs to make students more aware of AIDS and its prevention.

AIDS activities within the schools during the 1991-92 school year included:

- Universal precaution training for teachers and administrators. Workshops on AIDS prevention were provided by Denise Hurley and representatives of Massachusetts General Hospital and Whidden Hospital.

- Planned Parenthood's Heart-to-Heart program was piloted at the high school during year two. In May 1992, health educators and people with AIDS went into all high school classrooms to teach students about HIV and AIDS.

Substance Abuse Programs

The Chelsea community, like most impoverished urban communities, faces the many problems associated with drug abuse. Chelsea students too often either use drugs themselves or have family members who use drugs. However, prior to the partnership, Chelsea had not funded a single drug awareness program; any drug-related activities were based on state or federal funding.

Denise Hurley's title was expanded in year three to emphasize her responsibility for coordinating substance abuse prevention programs. Chelsea received a Drug Free School and Community grant from the U.S. Department of Education for 1991-92. The grant funds prevention and intervention projects and activities related to substance abuse. All teachers worked with the same substance abuse curriculum that included topics such as tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, other drugs, AIDS resulting from drug use, and self-esteem, self-respect and decision-making. Counselors helped elementary teachers introduce the new curriculum in their classrooms.

Project DARE (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) was presented to all sixth graders by two correctional officers from the Suffolk County Jail. Materials for the project were purchased through the Drug Free Grant. An additional substance abuse course was offered to Vietnamese students at the high school by MICAS (Metropolitan Indochinese Children and Adolescent Services), and peer leadership programs were introduced at three of the elementary schools.

BU's School of Social Work

The School of Social Work has played a critical role in instituting programs and providing a wide range of social services to students in the Chelsea schools. Terry Lane, Associate Dean for Development, Research, and Special Educational Projects at BU's School of Social Work, has directed this effort and firmly believes in the integration of education and human services:

> . . . schools must be required to have social service personnel as part of their core staff . . . School-based social service professionals help to create a healthy social climate in which learning can take place, healthy child development is valued, and families are welcomed as major participants in the life of the school.

Much of the work of the BU School of Social Work reflects this philosophy.

During the second year of the Chelsea-BU partnership, four BU staff members and five graduate student interns from the School of Social Work provided a variety of services primarily to Chelsea High School students; some services were also provided at the Williams School. Dr. Maria Meyer worked on-site in the high school four days a week. Her bilingual abilities, energy, and dedication all contributed to BU's success in this area during the second year. The arrival of a new principal who quickly recognized the multilayered problems of high school students and who was willing to accept assistance wherever she could find it also fostered the development and evolution of BU's social work activities in the high school.

Much of the emphasis at the high school during the second year of the partnership centered around violence prevention. Elsa Wasserman, the new principal, immediately identified violence in the high school, both physical and verbal, as a serious problem requiring attention. The violence prevention and intervention program subsequently instituted by BU consisted of four major components:

- Conflict resolution and mediation with individual students displaying violent behavior;
- Violence awareness and prevention groups for students who were repeatedly involved in fights;
- Meetings with parents to discuss violence; and
- Ongoing consultation with teachers and administrators to assist them in handling conflicts between students.

During the 1991-92 school year, sixth graders also received training in conflict resolution and violence prevention.

Individual counseling to students and families constituted another important component of BU's social work efforts in Chelsea during the 1990-91 school year. Identified by teachers and administrators, students with problems were referred to the social work team. Eleven students and families received ongoing counseling throughout the year; an average of 10 students per week were provided with brief crisis intervention services. When deemed appropriate, referrals were made to the school's crisis intervention counselor or school psychologist. Earlier in the school year, community agencies accepted referrals from the high school. Budget cutbacks, however, forced these agencies to close their waiting lists and not accept new clients.

The School of Social Work also worked with substance abuse problems in the high school. A group of eight students considered to be at-risk for substance abuse met weekly for an approximate two month period in the spring of 1991. However, because the participating students were not generally responsive, BU described this effort as a failure and dropped plans to expand group sessions for such students. Training workshops to assist teachers in identifying students at-risk of substance abuse were considered far more successful.

By the end of the second year, the groundwork was laid for a program — the Student Support Team — that, in some respects, became the hallmark of the School of Social Work's efforts in the high school during the 1991-92 academic year; it is this program that most closely adheres to Comer's concept of a School Development Program. The purpose of the team is to ensure that students who require special, coordinated services receive them.

Year three of the partnership saw the implementation of the Student Support Team. The team consisted of all school personnel and community agency staff responsible for providing health and human services to Chelsea High School students. The team met weekly to develop and coordinate service plans for five to eight individual high risk students per week, to discuss difficult cases and prepare treatment plans involving school and community resources, and to plan activities to fill service gaps. Professor Meyer served as the liaison between the high school and the community agencies. Also, members of the team provided in-service training to each other based on their individual areas of expertise. Staff at the high school initially resisted this clinical model of problem solving. However, as time moved onward, the staff began to look forward to the regular meetings for two distinct reasons: (1) staff members began to recognize the meetings as an efficient way of addressing problems; and consequently (2) the meetings became a mechanism through which staff could provide personal support to colleagues.

Maria Meyer and four BU School of Social Work interns also provided short-term counseling services to more than 225 high school students during the 1991-92 school year. These students were self-referred, referred by administrators or teachers, or targeted by the social work team, and counseling addressed both academic and personal issues. In addition, regular ongoing counseling services were provided to 15 students experiencing continual personal and behavioral difficulties in school.

Six group counseling sessions were also provided by Professor Meyer and the student interns and addressed such issues as dating, conflict resolution, substance abuse, and self confidence. The students who participated in these sessions recommended to the principal that the program continue the next year. Social work team members also met with parents, teachers, and administrators to discuss various behavioral and social issues.

The social work team also worked in the Williams and Shurtleff Schools. Group counseling services were offered at both schools to sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-graders. Issues discussed in groups with the children included violence, dating and relationships, sex and AIDS, alcohol and drug use, and racism and diversity issues. The group activities reached about 70 children at the Williams School and about 85 children at the Shurtleff School.

At the Williams School an after-school community service program called Team YES reaches 50 sixth- and seventh-graders; an additional 130 children participated in the program as part of their regular curriculum. Examples of the activities the children participate in include food drives for the Salvation Army, visits to local nursing homes, and community clean-up campaigns.

Health and Human Services Council

BU spearheaded the establishment of the Chelsea Health and Human Services Council in the fall of 1990 to implement Chelsea's comprehensive health plan, Blueprint for Health. The Council consists of representatives from the Chelsea School Department, the Chelsea Health Department, the Chelsea Human Services Collaborative, and BU. Its goal is "to provide students, preschool through grade 12, with comprehensive, coordinated health and human services programs that can be financially self sustaining and to insure that available resources are not wasted by fragmentation or duplication." In reality, the council has not adopted this formal role; rather, it serves as a vehicle for community agencies to share ideas and communicate about ongoing activities. The council's role seems to be more one of sharing information about current programs in Chelsea than one of spearheading initiatives. The council did, however, play an active role in the debate over the distribution of condoms in the high school, voicing the community's overwhelming approval of the plan ultimately demanded by the School Committee.

The Council's Project Coordinator, Stacy Swain, has worked closely with BU on health issues, including the development of the health curricula. At the end of the third year of the partnership, Stacy Swain resigned her position to work as a member of a health team in El Salvador. Swain, whose position had been jointly funded by BU and the Chelsea Memorial Health Center, had been responsible for numerous activities ranging from secretarial and administrative duties to program development. With her departure, there are questions about whether the new coordinator should continue to be jointly sponsored by BU and the Health Center or whether the responsibility should be shifted to a participating community agency.

There is no question that BU has invested considerable resources to develop health and human services activities in Chelsea. Making these types of services readily available is essential for many of Chelsea's students whose sole access to health and human services support is through the school. It should not be overlooked, however, that Chelsea had initiated a number of health and human services activities prior to the onset of the partnership. Together, BU's and Chelsea's joint efforts provide students with a significant pool of vital resources.

Conclusion

This chapter looks in some detail at the biggest and farthest-reaching programs and activities initiated or maintained by BU. These programs reach a good number of Chelsea students at both the elementary and secondary levels. Inevitably, some programs are not presented here. For instance, we have not looked at the Tae Kwon Do program offered to students after school in 1991-92, nor have we found a place to include mention of BU's granting of full tuition scholarships to four Chelsea High graduating seniors in 1991-92. Though we have

not presented an exhaustive summary of educational and other programs introduced in Chelsea under BU's management, the most far-reaching programs are included and their accomplishments through year three of the partnership described.

CHAPTER 5

The Impact of Educational Reform

In September 1992, after three years of managing the Chelsea Public Schools, BU submitted its first progress report to the Massachusetts State Legislature. Mandated by the 1989 legislation that created the partnership, this report summarized the project's accomplishments and disappointments to date. Paul Clemente, Chair of the Management Team at the time the report was released, noted in a letter contained within the report: "The results of the partnership's efforts to date have been remarkable progress under adverse circumstances and a sense that excellence in education can be synonymous with Chelsea Schools."

Other reviewers of the report, however, were far less positive about BU's impact on the Chelsea schools after three years:

- Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers, noted that "the project has failed to deliver on its promises" and labeled BU's perceived success as "claiming miracles for programs that are nothing more than plans."
- The title of a *New York Times* article, "An Experiment in Urban Education Stumbles," captures its assessment of the project's results.
- According to a *Boston Globe* article, Boston University's three-year progress report ". . . points to a massive infusion of new programs and private funding, but acknowledges few tangible results in student achievement."

Although these critics acknowledged the adverse and unanticipated conditions under which BU had to operate, they all noted the lack of improvement in student test scores and dropout rates to support the failing (or, at least, flailing) marks they gave BU. Those following the Chelsea-BU project expected to see "results" of some kind after three years. Given the national attention the project has received since the day it was conceived, coupled with some of BU's more public pronouncements regarding what their involvement would bring to the Chelsea schools, the press' critical reaction to the more quantifiable data presented in the progress report is not surprising. Ironically, these critics were not aware that BU's report glosses over some of the partnership's shortcomings and, at times, misleads the uninformed reader.

While critics have emphasized the partnership's failure to improve traditional student outcomes, conclusions presented in this report to the legislature are basically consistent with expectations BU laid out in its initial five-year action plan. Developed prior to its taking over the management of the Chelsea schools, this plan did not specify quantifiable objectives before the fifth year of the project. BU never claimed that improvements in students' test scores, dropout rates, and attendance rates would be immediate. In fact, in concluding its report to the state legislature, BU notes the following:

> "the partnership's success can only be adequately measured at the end of its ten-year commitment. To expect overnight success is to do an injustice to the very principles on which the partnership is built." (The Boston University/Chelsea partnership: Report to the Legislature, September, 1992).

Given the enormity of the task BU faced when it entered Chelsea, the rationale behind this perspective seems reasonable. Even BU's harshest critics will acknowledge that the Management Team has had to cope with numerous unforeseen circumstances. Most significantly, the fiscal crisis resulting in receivership has certainly hindered progress towards reaching the goals. BU could have legally withdrawn from the partnership when Chelsea was unable to meet its fairly modest financial obligations to the schools. Indeed, many assumed BU would leave. Its decision to remain in Chelsea must, in and of itself, be viewed favorably.

Evaluating BU's progress in Chelsea after three years is thus an extremely complex undertaking. On the one hand, BU's work to date is not as successful or as comprehensive as it could be. The action plan developed by BU before it ever took charge in Chelsea detailed activities the university intended to establish during each of the first three years. BU's success to date in fulfilling these objectives is mixed. Year one of the partnership did not see the accomplishment of all 13 objectives proposed for that year; some were achieved only partially and others not at all. The action plan was revised for year two, and the new plan's objectives were not as well defined as those of the original action plan. For year three, the year of "crisis management," the action plan seems to have been dropped entirely. No revision was implemented, and the original plan was certainly not adhered to.

Given the circumstances BU was forced to work under, abandoning an action plan while managing a crisis situation is difficult to fault. In addition, the flexibility which BU demonstrated and, at times, its creativity in running a school system with extremely limited resources must be recognized as well. However, the fact that BU has been forced to rely so heavily on ad hoc management raises an important concern about the value of its early planning efforts. Perhaps if BU and its leadership had emerged from its initial study of Chelsea with a realistic view of the city's fiscal situation, it would have been in a better position to monitor the partnership's objectives proactively, rather than reactively respond to Chelsea's crises by modifying or disregarding pre-set educational objectives.

Throughout it all, BU still voices a strong commitment to the achievement of the original 17 goals it established for the Chelsea schools. Its own legislative report can be described, in many ways, as a self assessment of its progress in moving toward these goals. BU claims progress in attaining its goals.

In this chapter, we review these 17 goals and provide our assessment of BU's successes and failures. It is important to bear in mind that BU's goals are long term, intended to be attained over the ten years of the partnership. Therefore it would be unreasonable to expect their complete attainment after three years.

In examining BU's progress toward attaining its goals for the Chelsea schools, we first briefly review the programs and activities that have been implemented or further developed to achieve the goals and assess where BU stands in relation to each of the goals. We also discuss the suitability of these goals for the remaining years of the project, particularly in light of the fiscal crisis that the Chelsea community and schools have faced in recent years.

Programs and Goals

Earlier chapters have described a number of activities and programs that BU has introduced in an effort to attain many of its goals. Exhibit 1 presents BU's 17 goals as well as the activities and programs that are related to the achievement of each of the goals. Some of these activities and programs were designed specifically to address the problems identified by the goals; other programs, while developed for other purposes, may also have an impact on the attainment of specific goals.

As the exhibit indicates, there has been considerable variation in BU's efforts to achieve its goals as of the end of the third year of the project. For example, a number of different dropout prevention activities have been initiated (Goal 4) but there has been very little effort to develop mechanisms to assess and monitor programs (Goal 16).

Simply identifying activities which are linked to the attainment of specific goals is not enough, however, since actual progress in reaching a goal may or may not be measured in terms of the number and types of activities developed. For in the end, BU will be assessed on its ability to demonstrate measurable improvement in the educational performance and achievement of Chelsea students.

Progress Toward Goal Attainment

Determining BU's progress in attaining it's goals is a more complex activity than matching activities with goals. Measuring progress is much more straightforward for some of the goals than for others. Goals dealing with quantifiable outcomes such as attendance and dropout

EXHIBIT 1

Chelsea-BU Policy Goals and Supporting Activities

CHELSEA-BU POLICY GOALS	ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS RELATED TO GOALS
1. Revitalize the curriculum of the school system so as to increase the rigor and breadth of the courses of instruction, including practice in organizing, integrating, and applying knowledge with an emphasis on reasoning, mastery of content, and problem solving.	a. Development of curriculum objectives first for grades K-5 followed by grades 6-8 and 9-12 b. Summer curriculum development institutes c. Regular professional development opportunities to support curriculum objectives d. Implementation of K-8 curriculum objectives

EXHIBIT 1

Chelsea-BU Policy Goals and Supporting Activities (Continued)

2.	Establish programs of professional development for school personnel and provide learning opportunities for parents.	**School Personnel** a. Curriculum institutes b. BU faculty support activities c. Sapphier Course d. Tuition scholarships for teachers **Parents** e. Intergenerational Literacy Project
3.	Improve test scores of students in the school system, especially the scores for each school and the system as a whole in the elementary grades in reading, writing, and mathematics.	a. Early Childhood initiatives to improve scores of participating students b. Curriculum development activities
4.	Decrease the dropout rate.	a. Voyager Academy (now defunct) b. Chelsea Futures (now defunct) c. Pathway School d. Dreams and Plans e. High Expectations Learning Program f. Digital Mentoring Program g. High school's attendance monitoring and tracking system h. Appointment of Dropout Prevention Director
5.	Increase the average daily attendance rate.	a. Health-related activities, such as the Dentistry Program and High School Health Center b. Programs with mandatory attendance policies, such as Tai Kwon Do and select music program activities (band, chorus) c. High school's attendance monitoring and tracking system d. Computerization of attendance records e. Dropout prevention activities
6.	Increase the number of high school graduates.	a. Dropout prevention activities b. Tutoring program

EXHIBIT 1

Chelsea-BU Policy Goals and Supporting Activities (Continued)

7.	Increase the number of high school graduates going on to attend four-year colleges.	a. b.	Annual financial aid workshops BU scholarships to Chelsea graduates
8.	Increase the number of job placements for graduates.	a.	No specific programs or activities have been established
9.	Develop a community school program through which before school, after school, and summer programs are offered to students in the school system and adult education classes for inhabitants of the city.	a. b. c. d. e. f.	Extended day early childhood program High Technology Home Daycare Project After school classes at each school HELP summer classes After school music program activities Adult Basic Education program
10.	Identify and encourage the utilization of community resources.	a. b. c. d. e. f.	BU liaison to the Chelsea community Chelsea Health and Human Services Council Chelsea Executive Advisory Committee High Technology Home Daycare Project High School Health Clinic BU's participation in and support of numerous community events and activities
11.	Establish programs which link the homes to the schools.	a. b. c. d. e. f.	Chelsea Home Instruction Program Parent Information Center High Technology Home Daycare Project School-sponsored "back to school" and "parent/teacher" nights Programs that encourage parent participation Programs that involve sharing student information with parents (e.g., dental screenings)
12.	Decrease teacher absenteeism.	a. b. c.	Professional development opportunities, such as curriculum institutes, BU faculty support activities, Sapphier Course, and Tuition scholarships for teachers Merit pay system Salary increases for teachers

EXHIBIT 1

Chelsea-BU Policy Goals and Supporting Activities (Continued)

13.	Improve the financial management of the school system and expand the range of operating funds available to the school system.	a. b.	Automation of financial record-keeping system Creation of A Different September Foundation
14.	Increase salaries and benefits for all staff, including raising the average teacher salary to make it competitive with the statewide average.	a. b.	Salary increases for teachers and administrators Award of generous salary for Superintendent Gawrys
15.	Construct effective recruiting, hiring, and retention procedures for staff members.	a. b. c. d.	Comprehensive approach to the recruitment of Superintendent Gawrys Development of new application forms Definition of criteria for the advertisement of open positions Development of screening committees to make hiring recommendations
16.	Establish student assessment designs and procedures which are of assistance in monitoring programs and which act as incentives for staff members in each school.	a.	Chapter 1 student assessment activities
17.	Seek to expand and modernize physical facilities in the school system.	a. b.	New schools plan Monetary commitment by Receiver to fund development of new schools

rates and test scores, for example, lend themselves to measurement more readily than some of the more process-oriented goals such as the identification and utilization of community resources.

BU's progress in reaching its student outcome-oriented goals during the first three years of the partnership has been mixed. One of BU's greatest accomplishments has been in the area of dropout prevention. Since BU began to manage the Chelsea schools, the annual student dropout rate has decreased 11 percentage points, dropping from 18 percent in the year prior to the onset of the partnership to 7 percent in the third year of the partnership.

Other indicators of student and teacher performance have declined or not changed significantly or consistently since BU took over the management of Chelsea's schools. These outcomes include:

- Overall average daily attendance rates have remained fairly stable — between 88 and 90 percent systemwide.

- There is no consistent trend in the number of job placements for graduating students; it has ranged from 27 percent in 1989 to 22 percent in 1990 and to 26 percent in 1991.

- With the exception of third graders, the basic skills test scores of Chelsea students have not improved.

- The SAT scores of Chelsea students showed a slight increase during year two and plummeted during year three.

BU's progress in reaching its teacher-oriented goals has also been mixed; to illustrate, the average teachers' compensation increased by 26 percent during the first three years of the partnership, although this figure is still 12 percent below the state average. Additionally, while BU has provided a range of professional development opportunities to Chelsea's teachers, there is widespread agreement that more is necessary. Even with increased salaries and professional development opportunities, the average daily teacher attendance rate has not improved — it has ranged between 94 and 96 percent throughout the duration of the partnership.

Evaluating BU's success in meeting some of the other goals requires attention to the breadth and progression of activities that have been introduced to support goal attainment. As an example, BU planned to revitalize the K-12 curriculum, but goal attainment was mixed. The development and implementation of curriculum objectives for grades K-5 proceeded much more quickly than did curriculum objectives for Chelsea's middle and high school. In fact, curriculum objectives were not developed for the high school until year three and implementation was not to occur until year four.

BU has been actively involved in a variety of activities — such as the creation of a BU liaison to Chelsea, community-based councils and committees, the development of programs in collaboration with the Chelsea community — in an effort to identify and encourage the utilization of community resources (Goal 10). In stark contrast, there has been very little activity to support the establishment of student assessment designs and procedures (Goal 16).

Below we examine each of the 17 goals and assess how far BU has come in attaining these goals.

1. **Revitalize the curriculum of the school system so as to increase the rigor and breadth of the courses of instruction, including practice in organizing, integrating, and applying knowledge with an emphasis on reasoning, mastery of content, and problem solving.**

BU spearheaded the development of curriculum objectives for grades pre-K through 12 during the first three years of the partnership. During year one curriculum objectives were developed for grades K-5. Curriculum objectives for grades 6 to 8 were developed in year two and for grades 9 through 12 in year three. In each case, new curricula were implemented in the year following development of objectives.

The revitalization of Chelsea's curriculum lagged behind BU's original plan of developing curriculum objectives for all grade levels by the end of year one. Apparent reasons for the sluggish development of curriculum objectives include the involvement of a limited number of BU

faculty members in the development process and the fiscal crisis that began to surface in the second year. Carole Greenes was the primary BU faculty member responsible for curriculum development, and, while actively committed to her work for the Chelsea schools, she was constrained by lack of assistance and a full workload at BU. Delaying the implementation of objectives for middle school students until year three and for high school students until year four left those students without a coherent curriculum for a significant portion of the partnership's duration and, more significantly, their own educational experiences.

2. **Establish programs of professional development for school personnel and provide learning opportunities for parents.**

BU has introduced a wide variety of professional development opportunities to Chelsea's elementary and middle school teachers throughout the course of the partnership, including: a summer curriculum institute focused on mathematics, science, reading, and social studies as well as one focused on early childhood education; small group workshops sponsored by BU faculty; the Sapphier Course for teachers and administrators; and tuition scholarships for Chelsea teachers interested in taking courses at BU. Few opportunities for staff development have been made available to teachers at Chelsea High School (with the exception of the Sapphier course). One exception was the introduction of monthly three-hour seminars during the 1991-92 school year to familiarize teachers with the newly introduced trimester system.

These staff development activities have been well received, although most faculty members would like to see more. A small set of critics within the school, however, contend that the staff development activities provided to teachers are not comprehensive and that the training modules do not build upon or complement one another. Despite this criticism, the majority of Chelsea's teachers and administrators who have participated in staff development activities perceive them and the involved BU staff members favorably. The only oft-mentioned incident of BU's neglect in the area of staff development, already explained in detail in Chapter 3, was its refusal to delay the opening of the high school in September 1991 long enough to provide teachers with some hasty instruction on how to teach under the new trimester system.

Another component of this goal is BU's pledge to provide learning opportunities for parents of Chelsea students. To date, there is not a great deal of evidence of progress toward this goal. Since the inception of the partnership, the Intergenerational Literacy Project (ILP), described in Chapter 4, has been the only formal initiative to focus on the provision of learning opportunities for parents. Also, though not its primary focus, the IBM High Technology Home Daycare Project provided free training workshops to approximately 90 parents and other community daycare providers during years two and three of the partnership.

3. **Improve test scores of students in the school system, especially the scores for each school and the system as a whole in the elementary grades in reading, writing, and mathematics.**

Several types of standardized test data are available for Chelsea students. During years two and three of the partnership, Chelsea began to computerize student test scores and other data. By the end of the 1991-92 school year, computerized data were available for the Massachusetts Basic Skills Test, the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), and the Achievement Test.

Exhibit 2 compares the percentage of third, sixth, and ninth grade students passing all three of the components of the Massachusetts Basic Skills Test (reading, writing, and mathematics) since the year prior to the inception of the partnership. This test was not administered during the 1991-92 school year due to state budget cutbacks. While there were small to moderate increases in the test scores of Chelsea's third and ninth grade students from partnership years one to two, the percentage of sixth and ninth grade students passing all three basic skills tests during year two was actually lower than it had been the year preceding the partnership. Although a smaller percentage of ninth grade students passed all three components of the Massachusetts Basic Skills Test each year than did third and sixth grade students, it was the sixth grade students who made no measurable gains on this outcome between years two and three of the partnership. In contrast, while the scores of third grade students declined slightly during the first year of the partnership, they have rebounded markedly. The percentage of Chelsea third grade students passing all three of the basic skills tests increased eight percent between 1988-89 and 1990-91.

EXHIBIT 2

Percentage of Students Passing All Three Components (Reading, Writing, and Mathematics) of the Massachusetts Basic Skills Test, by Grade (1988-89 to 1990-91*)

	Academic Year					
	1988-89		1989-90		1990-91	
Grade Level	Chelsea	Mass.	Chelsea	Mass.	Chelsea	Mass.
3	68	88	64	88	76	85
6	68	83	54	84	55	84
9	49	79	42	82	47	79

* Due to statewide budget cuts, the Massachusetts Basic Skills Test was not administered during the 1991-92 school year.

The percentage of Chelsea students who continue to pass all three components of the Basic Skills Test as they progress through the system declines much more sharply than the statewide percentages: In 1990-91, 76 percent of Chelsea third graders passed all three components, while only 55 and 47 percent of Chelsea sixth and ninth graders did. The decrease in percentages of older students passing the tests statewide is not nearly so dramatic: 85 percent of third graders statewide, 84 percent of sixth graders, and 79 percent of ninth graders.

A small percentage of Chelsea's high school seniors take the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) annually. While SAT scores increased slightly after BU began to manage Chelsea's schools, this trend was short-lived (see Exhibit 3). The average combined SAT score increased 34 points during the first two years of the partnership — from 664 in 1988-89 (the year before BU began to manage the schools) to 698 in 1990-91. During year three, however, the average combined score plummeted to 620, 78 points lower than the previous year and 44 points lower than the year preceding BU's entry into the Chelsea school system. BU explained this drastic decrease in its 1992 report to the Legislature: "Initial evaluation of the drop in SAT scores for 91/92 suggests a link between the introduction of a trimester plan with significantly larger classes and less attention to test preparation than previous years, because of the 1991 financial crisis in Chelsea" (p. 43).

It should also be noted that the SAT scores of Chelsea's students are well below national averages. In 1990-91, the average combined SAT score for college-bound high school seniors nationwide was 896, almost 200 points higher than the average for all Chelsea students taking this test. Thus, even the relative improvement in SAT scores from the first to the second year of the project must be viewed in light of Chelsea's extremely low national standing.

EXHIBIT 3

Average Combined Score of Chelsea Senior Class Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and Achievement Tests (1988-89 to 1991-92)

	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92
SAT				
Combined Score[1]	664	692	698	620
Number Taking Test	38	53	63	53
Percent Taking Test	24	29	36	37
Achievement Tests				
Combined Score[2]	421	432	469	488
Number Taking Test	6	16	13	9
Percent Taking Test	4	9	7	6

1 Combined Mathematics and Verbal Score.

2 Average of all scores.

Average scores on the Achievement Tests have increased steadily each year since BU began to manage the schools. These scores do not appear to have been negatively affected in year three by radical changes within the high school (see Exhibit 3). However, like the SAT, these scores are not exceptionally strong.

BU does not expect dramatic improvements in students' test scores until those who have participated in Chelsea's Early Childhood Program reach testing age, third grade for the Massachusetts Basic Skills Test and senior year for the Scholastic Aptitude Test and Achievement Tests. However, critics of the partnership view the equivocal student test scores as evidence of the partnership's failure to improve systematically the lot of Chelsea's students. While expecting drastic improvements in test scores after only three years of educational change might not be realistic, one might at least expect test scores to maintain their pre-partnership levels; instead, Chelsea's student's scores on several standardized tests have declined.

It is also legitimate to ask whether the needs of older students can be overlooked while focusing on younger children. BU has introduced a diverse set of educational programs and initiatives into the Chelsea schools — programs that are expected to influence students' motivation, achievement, and test scores. By claiming that observable effects will only become apparent as young children progress through the schools, BU is in effect discounting the potential impact of the programs the university is introducing for older children. If one were to accept BU's rationalization, one might legitimately ask why they bother to do anything at all for older students.

4. Decrease the dropout rate.

Chelsea High School has adopted numerous school-based programs for potential dropouts including the Pathway School, Dreams and Plans, High Expectations Learning Program, Digital Mentoring Program, and the now defunct Voyager Academy and Chelsea Futures. Additionally, the high school has a comprehensive attendance tracking and monitoring system to identify potential dropouts and has hired a Dropout Prevention Director to coordinate its diverse programs and activities.

Exhibit 4 presents the total number and percentage of students who dropped out of school since the 1988-89 school year by grade level. These values are based upon a comparison of the number of dropouts over a single one year period to the October 1 enrollment for that period. As is true nationally, Chelsea students in the ninth and tenth grades are more likely to drop out than their counterparts in the eleventh and twelfth grades. Overall, the annual student dropout rate has decreased by 11 percentage points since BU came into Chelsea, dropping from 18 percent in the last year before the partnership to 7 percent in the third year of the partnership. Additionally, viewing the data by grade level reveals that the decline in the annual dropout rate from year one to year two to year three is reflected in lower dropout rates each year at each grade level (with the exception of a slight increase in the rate of twelfth grade dropouts between 1989-90 and 1990-91).

EXHIBIT 4

Annual Number and Percentage of Students Dropping Out of School in Chelsea, by Grade (1988-89 to 1991-92)

	School Year							
	1988-89		1989-90		1990-91		1991-92	
Grade	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
9	60	17	66	27	40	17	14	6
10	47	20	50	26	35	14	29	12
11	20	11	35	19	21	12	12	6
12	16	10	12	7	16	9	7	5
Total (Grades 9-12)	143	18	163	20	112	13	62	7

In light of the high school's comprehensive dropout prevention initiative, it is not surprising that the annual dropout rate for Chelsea High School students has decreased since the inception of the partnership. While there is no data currently available to link students' dropout rates with their participation in specific dropout prevention programs or activities, it is likely that these programs have helped to counter the potentially explosive impact of the high school's structural reorganization during year three on students' dropout rates. For instance, although it is far too early to draw any conclusions about the causes behind dropout rates that could turn out to be the exception rather than the rule, it is possible to speculate that the substantial decrease in the dropout rate for ninth graders between 1990-91 and 1991-92 (a decrease from 17 to 6 percent) could be related to the crisis prevention training ninth grade teachers underwent as part of the Dreams and Plans program.

5. Increase the average daily student attendance rate.

Students may miss school for any number of reasons, from health-related problems, to frustration or lack of motivation at school, to difficulties at home. While all of BU's activities may ultimately affect student attendance rates, several programs have an immediate impact. The high school has adopted a comprehensive attendance monitoring system that includes an automatic telephone dialer to contact the homes of absent students, a committee to deal strictly with attendance issues, regular correspondence and conferences with students with excessive absences

and their parents, and incentives for good attendance (e.g., 50 high school students were offered tickets to a taping of the rock band Aerosmith during the Fall of 1991). BU's dental screening program for Chelsea's kindergarten through eighth grade students and the Health Center for Chelsea's high school students help to eliminate, or at least begin to treat, the health problems that make learning difficult for some students. Finally, participation in other programs (e.g., the popular Tai Kwon Do course and the music program's bands and choruses) is contingent upon regularly attending school.

Chelsea began to computerize its attendance data in 1989, and BU has adopted the 1990-91 school year attendance data as the baseline upon which to gauge changes in students' attendance rates. According to BU's 1992 Report to the State Legislature, the 1990-91 school year is the earliest that it can guarantee the quality of the school system's attendance data.

Exhibit 5 presents average daily attendance rates since the 1988-89 school year by school. While the overall attendance rates have remained fairly stable (within three percentage points) since BU assumed management of the schools, there was a drop during year two of the partnership. The high school's attendance rates have been the lowest of all schools, as well as the most erratic — in year one, the attendance rate was 83 percent, it dropped to 78 percent during year two, and increased to 81 percent in year three. This lack of improvement is not surprising,

EXHIBIT 5

Average Daily Attendance Rates for the Chelsea Public Schools (1988-89 to 1991-92)

SCHOOLS	SCHOOL YEAR			
	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92
Elementary				
Mary C. Burke	91	93	94	93
Prattville	93	92	94	93
Shurtleff	92	91	93	92
Williams*	89	91	92	90
High School				
Chelsea High	82	83	78	81
System-Wide	89	90	88	89

* Prior to 1991-92, Williams was both an elementary and a middle school.

however, since Chelsea's high school students have been challenged by major structural changes within the high school during years two and three of the partnership.

6. Increase the number of high school graduates.

The goal of increasing the number of Chelsea High School graduates (presumably the true goal is to increase the percentage of students who graduate) is inextricably linked to the goal of decreasing the dropout rate. The myriad programs comprising the dropout prevention initiative, along with BU's tutoring program, play a potentially important role in increasing the number of high school graduates.

In addition to the data presented in the previous section, anecdotal evidence also suggests initial progress toward attaining this goals. The 1992 progress report of the Pathway School at Chelsea High School provides an illustration. According to the report, "Fifteen students from the regular high school graduated in June [1992] thanks to [High Expectation Learning Program] HELP courses." Additionally, as a result of summer HELP course offerings, "five students, including a young man who had dropped out of school in 1984, completed high school graduation requirements in the course of the summer."

7. Increase the number of high school graduates going on to attend four-year colleges.

BU has initiated a number of activities to increase the number of high school graduates pursuing postsecondary education, including annual financial aid workshops and Boston University scholarships to Chelsea students on the basis of both academic merit and financial need. In 1991-92, BU provided full scholarships to four graduating Chelsea seniors.

While a goal of the partnership is to increase the number of high school graduates who attend four-year colleges, BU has not made data available on the actual post-graduation activities of Chelsea's high school seniors. In fact, in its 1992 Report to the State Legislature, BU presented the self-reported intentions of graduates to pursue post high school educational opportunities to support progress towards goal 7. The percentage of high school seniors planning to pursue any type of postsecondary education has increased since the inception of the partnership; 53 percent of the 1989 and 1990 classes, 61 percent of the 1991 class, and 60 percent of the 1992 graduating class intended to pursue postsecondary education. These data, however, do not indicate the percentage of graduates going on to attend four-year colleges or other postsecondary educational institutions.[1]

But, intention is no substitute for reality, especially in a city such as Chelsea, where economic conditions and lack of experience negotiating the postsecondary education system have a potentially major impact on its pursuit. BU must regularly collect data on the postsecondary education activities of Chelsea high school graduates in order to measure honestly progress toward this goal.

---

[1] The term postsecondary education encompasses a wide range of options, including two-year and less than two-year technical and vocational education as well as community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities.

8. Increase the number of job placements for graduates.

There is no consistent trend in the number of job placements for graduating students. In 1989, 27 percent of graduating seniors found work after graduation; in 1990, this figure dropped to 22 percent; and in 1991, the number of graduates obtaining work rose to 26 percent. The projected number of 1992 graduates who would obtain work soon after graduation was 25 percent, a slight drop from the previous year.

While BU has not actively developed programs to increase the number of job placements for Chelsea's high school graduates, it reported the previously mentioned statistics in its 1992 Report to the State Legislature. Reporting this data is misleading, however. An uninformed reader might attribute increases or decreases in job placements directly to BU's efforts — a tenuous conclusion given BU's lack of activity in this area and the important role played by the local and national economy. The only truly accurate conclusion to draw about attainment of this goal, as of the end of the third year of the partnership, is that BU has not taken any steps towards its attainment, and any fluctuation, either positive or negative, in the percentage of Chelsea High School graduates finding work cannot be attributed to BU's efforts.

9. Develop a community school program through which before school, after school, and summer programs are offered to students in the school system and adult education classes for inhabitants of the city.

BU has initiated several programs related to this goal, including an extended day early childhood program, the IBM High Technology Home Daycare Project, after school classes at each school, HELP summer classes at the high school, and after school music program activities (such as the piano lab, band, and chorus) and has supported the continuation of Chelsea's city-wide Adult Basic Education (ABE) program. Many students and adults participate in these activities and, with some exceptions (e.g., elimination of adult education ESL offerings, elimination of the high school band during the 1991-92 school year), these program offerings have been maintained, or expanded, by BU throughout the course of the partnership — even in the face of budgetary cutbacks.

Included as one of BU's original action plan objectives for years one and two was the development of "family learning centers" at each of the schools. This objective has fallen entirely by the wayside. Only the Intergenerational Literacy Project, which provided literacy instruction to 180 families in 1991-92, approximates the idea of a family learning center, but BU has made little or no effort since the beginning of the project to create family learning centers on any of the school campuses.

10. Identify and encourage the utilization of community resources.

The Office of Community Liaison for the Chelsea-BU Partnership was created to build relationships between BU and the Chelsea community. Vincent McLellan, Assistant to the President at Boston University, has worked behind the scenes for the past several years building relationships with community groups, encouraging their activities, and facilitating joint initiatives between BU and the community.

BU has played an integral role in the formation of community-based councils and committees, such as the Chelsea Health and Human Services Council and Chelsea Executive Advisory Council, to provide input into key educational decisions. BU has also indicated that it values such input from existing community organizations, such as the Human Services Collaborative. However, these groups share the perception that BU does not regularly seek out or utilize their input. As a result, it is premature to applaud BU's attempts to utilize community resources in educational decision-making.

BU has collaborated with the Chelsea community to develop a number of new programs and initiatives, including the High Technology Home Daycare Project and the Chelsea High School Health Clinic. These efforts are commendable, although widespread community cooperation and participation is still lacking.

Similarly, BU has participated in numerous community events and activities (e.g., the Chelsea Latin American Festival) and has supported the activities of other community groups and resources (e.g., BU has developed or contributed to grant proposals to groups such as the Chelsea Public Library and YMCA and sponsors an ongoing campaign to recruit Chelsea senior citizens to take reduced cost courses at BU). However, community distrust of BU lingers and more widespread participation on the part of BU would probably be beneficial.

11. Establish programs which link the homes to the schools.

The most notable accomplishment in this area is the successful establishment of the Chelsea Home Instruction Program, designed to help parents develop their preschool children's learning skills. The program has doubled in size since its pre-partnership inception and served 120 families in 1991-92. Other activities relevant to this goal include: the city-wide Parent Information Center, which serves as a centralized registration system for the school system, and provides a variety of information and support services to parents of Chelsea students and the community at large; the IBM High Technology Home Daycare Project; "back to school" and "parent/teacher" nights sponsored by the schools; and various programs that encourage parent participation or involve the sharing of student information with parents (e.g., dental screening of Chelsea's K-8th grade students, the high school's Dreams and Plans program, the joint BU/Parent Teacher Organization sponsored "Parent Checklist"). Parent Centers were set up in each school to provide a place where parents could feel comfortable going to learn more about their children's schooling; however, the centers have not been regularly staffed or publicized.

While these programs and activities provide varying degrees of opportunity for parent or family involvement, actually engaging parents in school activities continues to be problematic. To illustrate, a "back to school" night sponsored at Chelsea High School in the fall of 1992 was hailed a success by school administrators because 90 parents (representing a student body of almost 1,100) attended. BU appears to lack a cohesive plan for engaging parents and families in school activities, a pivotal step in forging the link between students' homes and their schools.

12. Decrease teacher absenteeism.

A major principle that underlies BU's educational approach to Chelsea's schools is the idea that "teachers should be ready to teach." BU has initiated several teacher-centered programs

to meet this objective, including varied professional development opportunities for teachers, a limited number of Boston University scholarships to support graduate credits, and a system of merit pay increases tied to teachers' performance. Teachers also received significant salary increases over the years of the partnership as part of BU's effort to bring the compensation of Chelsea's teachers closer to the statewide average. Arguably, all of these initiatives could include among their objectives decreasing teacher absenteeism.

The attendance rate of Chelsea's teachers, however, has not improved since BU began to manage the schools. On the contrary, the average daily teacher attendance rate has remained essentially stable: 95 percent during the 1989-90 school year, 96 percent during the 1990-91 school year, and 94 percent during the 1991-92 school year. This slight decline during year three of the partnership could potentially be explained by the numerous and strenuous trials teachers endured especially during year three, including staff cutbacks, the layoff of Chelsea's teachers, and the reorganization of the schools. BU's responsibility for these strains experienced by teachers is limited.

13. Improve the financial management of the school system and expand the range of operating funds available to the school system.

During year one of the partnership, BU initiated the automation of the school district's financial record-keeping system to create a single, integrated financial reporting structure accessible to all users (including the school department as well as individual schools). During years two and three, the automation of financial — as well as student data — systems continued as individual schools were brought on-line. By the end of the third year of the partnership, the decision was made to merge the school department's record-keeping systems (both financial and student data) with that of the city.

It is difficult to assess the effectiveness of BU's efforts to streamline the financial management of the Chelsea School system independent of the effects of the introduction of the state-imposed receiver to the city's management structure. The receiver assumed responsibility for the management of Chelsea at the beginning of the third year of the partnership. At that time, the school department's budget had been cut significantly, raising questions about the viability of Chelsea's public schools. Although left largely alone to manage the schools, BU was obligated to channel all financial matters through the receiver's office and, in December 1991, the deputy receiver announced that the school department's budget would be scrutinized by an outside team of experts.

The second component of goal 13 involves the expansion of the operating funds available to the school system. Despite its efforts, BU has experienced difficulty achieving this objective. In January 1991, BU created the fundraising agent, A Different September Foundation, to solicit and receive funds for BU's educational initiatives, especially its early childhood program. While the Foundation has successfully obtained funds from foundations and other donors, it has not raised as much money as had been originally anticipated. Failure to do so might reflect over-optimism, especially given the depressed state of the national and regional economies during the Foundation's first years of operation as well as Chelsea's fiscal crisis and uncertainty.

14. Increase salaries and benefits for all staff, including raising the average teacher salary to make it competitive with the statewide average.

BU has made progress in reaching this goal, a fact that is impressive, in and of itself, given Chelsea's fiscal crisis and its resistance to allocate funds to education. When BU entered the partnership, the average salary of Chelsea's teachers was 33 percent below the state average. Over the first three years of the partnership, BU increased teachers' compensation, on average, by 26 percent. By 1992, teachers' salaries were only 12 percent below the state average, a 21 percent improvement from the year prior to the onset of the partnership. Although teachers' salaries continue to lag behind the average for the state, the gap has narrowed considerably. In addition to these needed increases, BU has put into place a system of regular performance pay increases for teachers. This system has not been supported by the teacher's union, and the details of its implementation have been a point of controversy between BU and the union.

There has also been a marked improvement in the compensation offered to Chelsea's school administrators. Administrators' salaries, 36 percent behind the state average the year prior to the onset of the partnership, have increased on average by 22 percent since BU began to manage the schools.

BU has struggled with the Chelsea community to offer a competitive salary that would attract a competent replacement for Peter Greer, superintendent *ad interim* of Chelsea's schools during the 1991-92 school year. Greer's successor was offered $100,000 annually, a salary that seemed excessive to many Chelsea residents but is not out of line with the salaries of other urban superintendents.

15. Construct effective recruiting, hiring, and retention procedures for staff members.

BU adopted a comprehensive approach to recruiting and hiring the superintendent to replace Peter Greer. The search for a replacement took place during the spring of 1992. The approach included a nationwide search for potential candidates, an extensive interview process that included discussions with numerous representatives of BU (e.g., representatives from the BU Management Team, dean of BU's School of Education) and open community forums in which finalists responded to questions from the Chelsea community.

According to BU's 1992 Report to the Legislature, the partnership has taken a number of steps to improve overall recruiting, hiring, and retention procedures, including developing new application forms, setting criteria for the advertisement of open positions, and developing screening committees to make hiring recommendations to the superintendent (members may include Chelsea faculty, parents, and/or paraprofessionals, depending upon the position in question). It is unclear, however, the extent to which these changes have been utilized in the recruitment, hiring, and retention of teachers since very few new teachers have been hired.

16. Establish student assessment designs and procedures which are of assistance in monitoring programs and which act as incentives for staff members in each school.

BU has not taken any formal steps to institute assessment procedures designed to monitor the successes or failures, as measured by student achievement, of the programs it has introduced.

Designations of success and failure have remained very informal throughout the first three years of the partnership. For instance, BU perceived some problems in the early childhood program under the leadership of its first director and brought in one of its own professors to assess the situation. Another example of an informal assessment of a program's effectiveness occurred in the case of the small group meetings with students at-risk of drug abuse. This attempt at drug abuse prevention was dropped because the BU members involved believed the teenagers did not respond to it well. Again, this assessment relied on perceptions rather than measurements of student outcomes. To date, BU is not assessing the effectiveness of its programs with quantifiable data measuring student outcomes.

The ability to rely upon assessments of student achievement as proper indicators of programs' successes or failures is premature at this point in the partnership. The changes made to the early childhood program were only initiated at the beginning of year three; their effectiveness, therefore, cannot be determined by the achievements of one class of students over one year.

17. Seek to expand and modernize physical facilities in the school system.

The construction of new school facilities remains a high priority with BU; its attempts to achieve this goal represent one of many poignant conflicts between BU and the Chelsea community. Chelsea's school buildings are old — all of the schools were built between 1881 and 1909 — and chronically overcrowded. The schools have deteriorated to the point that entry into the schools' grounds may be hazardous. In addition, the schools are riddled with the same problems faced by many older buildings, such as lead paint and fire code violations. To proceed with its plans to expand and modernize Chelsea's school facilities, BU requires the cooperation and financial commitment of the Chelsea community.

While there is a tendency to evaluate BU's, and not the Chelsea community's, progress and shortcomings with regard to the Chelsea-BU partnership, it is clear that it is the Chelsea community that has fallen short with regard to this goal. Massachusetts began a program in 1948 to reimburse school districts anywhere from 50 to 90 percent of the cost of constructing new schools. The Massachusetts Legislature awarded Chelsea a special 95 percent reimbursement rate in 1990 and reaffirmed it in the Fall of 1992. However, the city has consistently refused to commit the funds needed to modernize or replace its antiquated schools — and is the only community in the state that has failed to take advantage of the state's offer to share the cost of new schools. The community's resistance to support the construction of new schools is difficult to comprehend since estimates of the cost to Chelsea of repairing the existing facilities (approximately $47 million) far outweigh the cost to Chelsea of building new schools ($2.5 million).

In 1991, former receiver James Carlin committed the city's five percent share to the construction of new schools, although proponents of the new schools proposal have continued to meet with resistance from the community. As recently as October 1992, a member of the Chelsea School Committee hosted a tour of the schools in the ongoing effort to gain support for new schools.

Conclusion

At the most general level, BU's progress in reaching its goals is mixed. In most areas, BU has introduced at least minimal programming to support the attainment of its goals. In some areas, a coherent and comprehensive set of activities has been initiated. Measuring progress in attaining these goals is much easier for some of the goals than for others. Goals dealing with quantifiable outcomes such as attendance and dropout rates and test scores, for example, lend themselves to measurement more readily than some of the more process-oriented goals such as the identification and utilization of community resources. Unfortunately, BU did not continue its efforts of the first two years to break these 17 goals down into an annual working action plan with more specific and measurable outcomes.

It is the case that BU's more measurable outcomes are those which educators traditionally use to evaluate programs. On some of these measures, dropout rates, for example, BU has been able to demonstrate improvements. This is not the case in other areas, however. Despite widespread criticism for using standardized test scores as a measure of a student's progress and a program's success, this outcome is still regularly employed. With the exception of third graders, the test scores of Chelsea students have not improved. BU's many explanations for these results — the fiscal crisis, the academic reorganization of the high school, and the need for additional time — have not been generally accepted by critics of the partnership. Furthermore, while it might be premature to expect improvement in these measurable outcomes, it does seem reasonable to expect students not to lose ground in this area.

The arena in which BU has invested most of its energy and resources is in the development of a comprehensive early childhood program. Interestingly, this is not one of BU's 17 goals. This raises questions about the usefulness of the goals themselves and the potential need for an annual action plan which assesses progress and reassesses where the project needs to focus its short- and long-term attention. Our discussion of these goals results from BU's continued reliance on them as a yardstick. For even in the midst of crises, BU insisted that these goals were still driving their actions. It is unclear, however, whether these goals do indeed drive BU.

One could also ask whether these goals should continue to shape BU's actions for the remaining years of the partnership. Flexibility can be deemed a virtue, particularly for long-term projects such as the Chelsea-BU partnership. Economies change, staff comes and goes, and new ideas inevitably emerge. While goals and a long-term plan are vital to the success of comprehensive educational reform initiatives, it is not clear that BU's original 17 goals still reflect the needs, or limitations, of the Chelsea community. It seems wise for BU to re-visit its original goals in light of Chelsea's evolving needs and re-channel its resources and efforts to better reflect the "pulse of the community" during the remaining two-thirds of its tenure in Chelsea.

CHAPTER 6

Educational Reform and the Chelsea Community: Involvement and Reactions

To document and assess the players, programs, activities, and outcomes of an endeavor such as the Chelsea-BU partnership is a complicated task. To capture the nebulous quality of the relationships between the key players is even more difficult. The success of an endeavor is often determined as much by the strength of feeling between the parties of a relationship as by the desirability of success, and, likewise, failure can be assured if a relationship is marred by distrust, resentment, and suspicion.

The relationship between BU and the Chelsea community can be summarized, on the whole, as one of strong, mutual distrust, resulting in Chelsea blaming BU for too many of the community's problems and in BU excluding the community, even its elected officials, from the decision-making process. After the completion of three full years of the project, only minimal headway has been made in improving communication between the parties and in expelling distrust and dislike.

Responsibility for this failure to work well with each other cannot be laid solely at the feet of either BU or Chelsea. Both BU and the Chelsea community have made some attempts to accommodate each other. BU has on several occasions channeled energy and resources to the community beyond the scope of education proper, and segments of the Chelsea community have participated in collaborative projects with BU. Furthermore, BU appointed a liaison to the community during the first year of the partnership with the goal of better understanding the community and involving it in BU's activities. However, the progress that has been made in improving good will between the two parties has generally been made at the individual level, not at the institutional level. The predominant feeling towards BU among members of the Chelsea community remains one of resentment, and, as evidenced by BU's perennial disregard for the city's elected officials, BU's sentiment towards the community remains one of "father knows best."

This chapter investigates the nature and evolution of the relationship between BU and Chelsea. It describes the backdrop against which all educational decisions and programs take place. The actions and feelings described fall into two general categories: BU's participation in activities peripheral to education and its attempts to foster collaborative efforts and, perhaps BU's single gravest error in its handling of the partnership to date, Silber's and the Management Team's exclusion of Chelsea community members from the decision-making process.

Factions Within the Chelsea Community

A discussion of the relationship between BU and the Chelsea community cannot take on proper perspective without first considering the disparate racial and ethnic groups that comprise the city's population. There is no question that the Chelsea community itself is factionalized. Thus, when we refer to "the Chelsea community," we are not really writing about a population that has uniform needs or uniform goals for Chelsea's future. Rather, we are discussing a community of diverse cultures, aspirations, and reactions to BU's presence in the city.

Many of the older white members of the community, who were raised in Chelsea and who raised their own children there, remember a different Chelsea and a different school system. Despite the fact that many of these citizens were once immigrants themselves, typically Eastern European, they generally do not understand or sympathize with the unique problems of Chelsea's newer immigrants — primarily Latinos, Vietnamese, and other Southeast Asians. Furthermore, these older citizens' children graduated from Chelsea's schools years ago and typically moved out of the community. Their stake in the public schools is not direct, and they have different claims on the community's resources.

However, it is this segment of the community that is most actively, or at least politically, involved in educational issues in Chelsea. Five of the six members of the Chelsea School Committee are white and have no school-aged children. Furthermore, although 1990 census data give the racial composition of Chelsea to be approximately 60 percent white, 31 percent Hispanic, 4 percent African-American, and 5 percent Southeast Asian, the children enrolled in Chelsea's schools do not closely resemble the community population. The racial composition of the Chelsea student body has remained steady since the beginning of the partnership at approximately 55 percent Hispanic, 27 percent white, 13 percent Southeast Asian, and 5 percent African-American. Thus Chelsea's elected school committee, judging by racial composition alone, is even less representative of the population served by the schools than it is of the community as a whole.

Chelsea's immigrant groups have their own unique sets of needs and cultural characteristics they bring into the community and into the community's relationship with the university. For instance, as was documented in the Implementation study, Indochinese and Latino parents, often uneducated themselves, are not accustomed to questioning the actions of school leaders. Furthermore, many members of the Latino population in Chelsea are undocumented. Consequently they, along with other unnaturalized immigrants, cannot vote to support the educational measures that would benefit their children, and they hesitate to get involved in official community activities.

There are also divisions within the community's ethnic groups. For example, the Latino community has splintered into two groups — those interested in pursuing a political formula for assisting Chelsea's Latino population and those interested in pursuing solutions within the Latino community to their community's social and cultural needs. The Chelsea Hispanic Commission and Centro Hispano de Chelsea are two community groups that

represent the interests of the small percentage of Chelsea's Latino population who favor the political route. Marta Rosa, the first Latino elected to the Chelsea School Committee, is an activist prominent in the politically-motivated activities of these groups. The Chelsea Latin American Cultural Association, Inc., serves as an outlet for those not interested in pursuing the agenda touted by the political activists. During year three of the partnership, this group was involved in three major community-centered activities: planning and implementing the annual Latin American Cultural Festival, developing Chelsea's Soccer and Sports Club, and planning for the creation of a Latin American Cultural Center in Chelsea. Thus, there are two different agenda being put forth by the city's Latino residents, and two different accompanying responses — one of outrage and one of passivity — to BU's role in Chelsea.

One might question how BU can be expected to understand and work well with such a diverse community when factions of that community neither understand nor work well with each other. However, if Chelsea groups worked well with one another they might not have needed BU to solve its problems. Potentially, BU could teach different groups to develop productive working relationships by showing what could be accomplished when two contentious groups — BU and Chelsea — work together.

BU's Involvement With the Chelsea Community

One of BU's original 17 goals for the partnership was to "identify and encourage the utilization of community resources." Attainment of this objective really encompasses the establishment of specific programs or activities that link the schools to the greater community. The establishment of such programs, in turn, relies on the approval and participation of the Chelsea community, a disjointed group at best.

BU has taken steps toward attaining this objective, though these steps are of dubious coherence. Some of the university's activities in this area are loosely linked together through the office of BU's Community Liaison to Chelsea while others fall under the heading of "education".

The Role of BU's Official Liaison to the Chelsea Community

During the first year of the partnership, John Silber appointed Vincent McLellan to be BU's liaison to the Chelsea community. His official responsibilities are twofold: (1) to identify community-based needs, as defined by Chelsea residents, and help community groups in their efforts to meet them; and (2) to build awareness and support for the Chelsea-BU partnership and its activities within the community. He is thus BU's eyes and ears in Chelsea as well as its public relations representative on the street.

Vin McLellan has immersed himself in the Chelsea community, spending a considerable amount of time attending community meetings and other functions and informally chatting with residents of the city; much of his time appears to be spent "explaining" BU to the community. While sensitive to Chelsea's diverse ethnic population, McLellan is a firm

believer in what BU is doing. His effectiveness, however, in the indistinct domain of fostering good feeling — both in helping the community understand BU and in helping BU, particularly the Management Team, understand and work with the Chelsea community — is difficult to assess at this point.

Initially, members of the Management Team expressed concerns and doubts about McLellan's role in the project. Because he reports directly to John Silber, the Management Team has no control over McLellan's work. He is not a member of the Management Team and is one of the few staff hired by BU to work exclusively on the Chelsea-BU project. By the end of the third year of the project, however, some Management Team members indicated that McLellan was becoming an asset to the project.

Through McLellan's office, BU has "quietly worked to strengthen, support, and enrich the efforts of a wide variety of local Chelsea groups" (BU/Chelsea Liaison Report, May 1, 1992). BU has worked with numerous community groups and participated in a variety of community activities, ranging from working with local city officials and activists to garner support for the failed 1991 attempt to override the Proposition 2 1/2 tax cap, to serving on the board of directors for local groups (e.g., Coalition of Chelsea Food Providers, Reaching Out To Chelsea Adolescents), to participating in local cultural celebrations. Some examples of BU's work within the Chelsea community include:

- Joint involvement with the community on proposals for the city's "Weed and Seed" Program;
- Public support of city officials who were in favor of a Proposition 2 1/2 override;
- Public support of city officials and community representatives who favor the development of new schools in Chelsea; and
- Work with state officials to obtain special legislation that ensures the state's payment of 95 percent of the cost of new schools.

BU has also attempted to foster good feeling through such acts as providing the community with access to Chelsea's school facilities for cultural festivals (e.g., Chelsea's annual Latin American Festival) and purchasing, in collaboration with local ethnic clubs, Newcomer video tapes in Spanish and Polish to orient new immigrants of all ages to American culture.

Another facet of BU's effort to promote mutual involvement is the development of joint collaborations. BU and selected community representatives have collaborated in the development of educational programs and related initiatives, though not so many as BU's critics would like to see. To date there are two primary collaborative efforts, both described in more detail elsewhere in this report. The High Technology Home Daycare Project provides a computerized linkage between BU's School of Education, the Chelsea School Department, Massachusetts General Hospital/Chelsea Memorial Health Center, and selected Chelsea center- and home-based day care providers. The Chelsea High School Health Clinic is a joint

initiative of BU's School of Public Health and the Massachusetts General Hospital/Chelsea Memorial Health Center.

Another important collaborative effort occurred during year three of the partnership. The Management Team created an Early Childhood Task Force, which included representatives from Chelsea's Head Start program and the city's private, non-profit pre-school programs, to investigate possibilities of providing pre-school programs to all Chelsea three- and four-year-olds. The task force reviewed the capabilities of all of the city's pre-school facilities. In the spring of 1992, BU's Early Learning Center co-sponsored with Chelsea's other pre-school programs an open registration for pre-schoolers and their parents and made sure that all interested three- and four-year olds were placed in educational programs for the upcoming school year.

BU's Decision-Making Style and the Chelsea Community

One of the unique features of the Chelsea-BU partnership is the fact that an outside entity, a private university, has been given the responsibility of managing the Chelsea public schools on a day-to-day basis. However, while the BU Management Team serves in the capacity of a school committee, Chelsea's elected School Committee — well-entrenched in the politics of the Chelsea community — has been retained as an advisory board to the Management Team. Over the first three years of the partnership, BU and Chelsea have differed widely over a number of key issues. Furthermore, even in instances when the Chelsea School Committee and wider community have agreed in principle with BU's decisions and proposed programs, BU's style of decision-making, a top-down approach that often ignores the opinions of the Chelsea community, has angered the community.

The sole purpose behind BU's presence in Chelsea is, of course, to improve all aspects of Chelsea's education system. It has become increasingly clear, however, that BU is following a predefined agenda for the restructuring of the Chelsea schools. Many of Chelsea's educators and community representatives believe that this agenda has been set and compliance with it ensured primarily by one individual — BU's president, John Silber. While the community feels, and rightly so, that its input is vital to the establishment of an educational system that will reflect the city's unique needs and desires, BU's efforts to include the community in key educational decisions have been perceived by many in the community as insufficient.

At first, BU made decisions without actively consulting with or attempting to build a consensus among community interests, citing its interest in making immediate changes to the ailing system. Now, as BU has completed almost one-third of its 10 year commitment, it is still criticized for excluding the community — especially the Chelsea School Committee — and for denying community members opportunities to review vital information and to participate in educational decision-making. To illustrate, the School Committee did not have a substantive role in the selection of John Gawrys, Chelsea's third superintendent under the partnership, although, traditionally, this decision would have been made by such a committee. The Chelsea Record has illustrated the Chelsea School Committee's dissatisfaction with its exclusion and lack of information about key educational decisions. According to a December

30, 1992, article, members of the School Committee have been excluded from several educational functions since the inception of the partnership, including the open house of the new Chelsea High School Health Center during partnership year four.

In addition to its exclusion from educational functions, the School Committee often does not receive advance information pertinent to current educational issues. Members of the School Committee received information about the proposed 1992-93 school department budget from BU just prior to a public budget hearing. Additionally, the School Committee first became aware of BU's altered year four construction plans for Chelsea's schools at a BU Management Team meeting.

Several other community-based committees and councils (e.g., the Chelsea Executive Advisory Committee (CEAC) and the Chelsea Health and Human Services Council) have also criticized BU for its unwillingness to exchange information and ideas with the Chelsea community. These two community-based groups, whose specified roles include the provision of information and advice to BU in order to inform key educational decisions, have not served as active participants in the educational decision-making process and do not perceive that BU actively pursues their input or ideas on key issues. Given the perceived lack of communication between BU and these community-based representatives, it is no surprise that many in the community criticize BU for its top-down management style and its unwillingness to embrace the Chelsea community as a vital partner in Chelsea's educational reform effort.

There are educators and community groups, however, who have noted significant improvements in BU's ability to communicate with Chelsea since the partnership's tumultuous beginnings. Chelsea's city-wide Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO) believed that it could effectively communicate its ideas and opinions to BU through direct, one-on-one communication and, as a result, withdrew as a member of CEAC during the third year of the partnership. While a number of educators and community members agree that BU has made major strides in its ability to "listen" to Chelsea's concerns, many contend that BU still does not "hear."

BU's perceived reluctance to solicit information or opinions from representatives of the Chelsea community or to act upon the community's concerns — regardless of how strongly they are presented — has created tensions, and more than a few conflicts, between these two entities. The debate over the distribution of condoms at Chelsea High School received significant press coverage during year three of the partnership. While the Chelsea community overwhelmingly supported the distribution of condoms, the BU Management Team voted against the measure, citing moral and legal concerns. The Management Team's refusal to adopt a policy that was clearly favored by the community led the Chelsea School Committee — whose members were elected by the community to represent its educational interests — to override the Management Team's decision. The community also repeatedly questioned the Management Team's decision to channel scarce educational resources to the expansion of the school system's early childhood program at the exclusion of programs for other students.

Relationships, however, are not one way streets. While most conflicts seem to be exacerbated by BU's apparent unwillingness to consider the views of members of the Chelsea community, the Chelsea community has also posed an obstacle to the progress of the Chelsea-BU partnership. In what to an outside observer appears to be an incomprehensible demonstration of the community's shortsightedness, the community has regularly opposed BU's attempts to garner support for the construction of new schools in Chelsea. BU has placed a high priority on the construction of new schools to replace Chelsea's old, chronically overcrowded, and often hazardous school buildings. But many members of the Chelsea community, including its newest representative to the School Committee, have spoken out against the need for new schools.

The Chelsea community has also obstructed the development of good feeling between itself and BU with its tendency to blame BU for the misfortunes that have crippled the city. Some members of the community have gone so far as to blame BU for Chelsea's having gone into receivership in September 1991, reasoning that BU had overspent Chelsea's limited funds. However, this assignment of blame was unjustified, as BU's expenditures in the school department remained within its share of the city's budget.[1]

The tensions evident between Chelsea and BU were actually somewhat relieved by BU's continued commitment to the partnership in the face of Chelsea's fiscal turmoil and its placement into state receivership. The blame that was typically placed on BU when budget cuts forced the elimination or restriction of educational programs (e.g., drastic cuts in physical education, arts) now had a new target. The receiver replaced BU as the primary scapegoat for Chelsea's fiscal woes, eliminating a major source of contention.

BU's unwillingness to share power with members of Chelsea's leadership and to include them in the decision-making process suggests a true lack of foresight. BU has made little effort to prepare the Chelsea community and its leaders to take over when BU departs. The decision of the 1989 School Committee to relinquish management of the schools to BU implied that its members had little faith in their own or the city's ability to cope with the problems facing the schools and, further, that BU could do better. However, the relationship is not a permanent one, and in order to take over effectively at the conclusion of the partnership, the School Committee, school administrators, teachers, and the community at large must have an understanding of and faith in the many educational changes and know how to maintain them.

---

[1] Furthermore, a Massachusetts Department of Education report comparing the educational situations in Holyoke, Lawrence, Brockton, and Chelsea at the beginning of the 1991-92 school year (the third year of the partnership and the beginning of receivership) found that the Chelsea schools were in many respects much better off than their counterparts in the three other financially depressed communities. One could speculate that BU actually helped to cushion the blow of spiralling economic conditions in Chelsea, providing assistance that was not available to the other school districts under study.

Even if BU's long range plans include the introduction of some sort of mentoring or community development during the later years of the partnership, it is shortsighted to think that the School Committee and others will blindly follow those who have systematically excluded them from the laying of the groundwork. It is ironic that BU, the presumed expert of educational reform and progress, has failed to provide the Chelsea community with even basic instruction about how to manage a school system. The university's lack of foresight certainly has the potential of resulting in a backslide after the completion of the Chelsea-BU partnership.

CHAPTER 7

The Chelsea-BU Partnership: A Story of Survival

This report has described the second and third years of the Chelsea-BU partnership, years rife with conflict and crises and generally devoid of traditional signs of educational progress. A severe financial shortfall forced the city of Chelsea into state receivership; as a consequence of receivership, the city could not maintain its financial commitment to the project at the levels agreed upon at the onset; as a further consequence, BU was forced to fire one fourth of Chelsea's teaching force; three superintendents have headed the Chelsea schools in four years; and tensions and distrust between BU and the Chelsea community were as much a part of this unique and unusual relationship at the end of three years as they were at the beginning. Thus, it is easy to understand why John Silber might describe BU's major accomplishment after three years as "survival."

Although BU's accomplishments extend beyond mere survival, they certainly are not reflected in most standard measures of educational progress.

- Although a higher percentage of third graders had passed all three sections of the Massachusetts statewide achievement tests since BU arrived in Chelsea, the percentages of sixth and ninth graders passing all three sections actually declined. The passing rate among sixth graders dropped rather dramatically, from 68 percent in 1988-89 to 54 percent in 1989-90 and 55 percent in 1990-91.

- The SAT scores of Chelsea High School seniors plummeted in year three to 44 points below their pre-partnership average; scores on College Board achievement tests have risen, although the number of students taking these tests is still small.

- Daily attendance rates for both teachers and students have remained essentially constant — and at their pre-partnership rates — throughout BU's involvement in Chelsea.

One encouraging, if tentative, sign of BU's impact on the Chelsea schools is the annual dropout rate, which fell from 18 percent before BU's arrival in Chelsea to under eight percent in the 1991-92 school year. BU's progress in lowering the annual dropout rate is worthy of recognition and praise. Although it is not possible to link students' participation in specific programs directly to outcomes, such as staying in school, BU's many efforts in the area of dropout prevention, including a major program funded by the RR Nabisco Foundation, appear to be paying off.

However, the decrease in the annual dropout rate is, at the partnership's third year mark, one of the only truly encouraging quantifiable outcomes. Other less than favorable results on standardized tests and attendance rates have raised many eyebrows, particularly in the media. They also raise some very serious questions about the effects of educational reform in general and

the outcomes of the Chelsea-BU partnership in particular. What, for example, should be considered reasonable expectations for success after any three-year, systemwide school reform effort? How does one weigh the many serious and unanticipated crises BU faced against unfulfilled expectations of improvement in student educational outcomes?

In this report, we have attempted to capture the tensions between evaluating standard educational outcomes on the one hand and recognizing the impediments placed in BU's path on the other hand. There is no question that BU has had little or no impact in improving most students' test scores or students' and teachers' daily attendance rates. But in fairness to BU, the obstacles it faced during the first three years would make any signs of improvement on measures such as test scores and attendance rates remarkable. And one cannot overlook the fact that BU stuck with Chelsea. Despite the city's inability to comply with the original terms of the agreement and despite the many, many unexpected crises that interfered with BU's original school reform plans, BU did not abandon the project.

Looking beyond these conditions that could legitimately be used to excuse BU, the educational reform literature warns against expecting measurable improvements too quickly, particularly in the areas typically examined in standard evaluation efforts. Furthermore, some educational reform experts believe that standard achievement measures may not adequately capture the essence of school reform efforts, especially when systemwide restructuring is the goal (David, 1990). While this literature does not necessarily advocate the elimination of reliance upon standardized test results, it does emphasize the need to develop new measures of student progress.

Interestingly, one of BU's original 17 goals is the establishment of "student assessment designs and procedures which are of assistance in monitoring programs and which act as incentives for staff members in each school." By the end of the third year, BU had not taken any steps towards developing such assessment tools. Without knowing what BU's own criteria of success are, BU is bound to be judged by traditional educational outcome measures. If it is premature to apply standard measures of educational achievement to the reform effort in Chelsea, and we believe it may be, what measures should be used?

As is true in evaluating any school reform effort, it is necessary to look beyond readily quantifiable data in measuring achievements, particularly when the proposed reform project is less than one third complete. BU thus needs to be recognized for several identifiable successes, successes which are identifiable though not measurable. The establishment of a health clinic in the high school, for example, provides the full range of medical care to high school students who wish to enroll in the program. Approximately 85 percent of all elementary school children in Chelsea have participated in dental screenings and basic hygiene instruction. A first-rate music program provides Chelsea children with extensive music instruction that includes choral and instrumental music, both within the regular curriculum and during after-school hours.

Finally, BU's greatest and most visible success by the end of the third year of the partnership is surely the establishment of its Early Childhood Program. The philosophy of the overall program as well as the quality of its individual components — from the exemplary Early Learning Center to the Chelsea Home Instruction Program to the Home Technology Learning Centers — have elicited praise from many different observers of the partnership.

As has been documented in this report, however, BU's devotion to this showcase program is not without its critics. BU has devoted a significant share of its limited resources to this effort, much to the concern of many in the Chelsea community who believe that middle- and high-school students have been ignored at the expense of preschool-aged children. BU has chosen to disregard this criticism and at the end of the third year, had plans in place to expand its early childhood efforts.

BU's indifference to the opinions of the Chelsea community regarding early childhood education is not an isolated incident. As we have illustrated, BU has failed to respond to and work with the Chelsea community since the partnership's inception. **The relationship between BU and Chelsea does not operate like a partnership, it in no way resembles a partnership, and indeed, it is not a partnership**. And while Chelsea's many crises can legitimately explain BU's limited successes on quantifiable educational outcomes, these crises cannot justify BU's repeated failure to listen to Chelsea residents and bring them into the decision-making process, both formally and informally.

BU's failure to include the Chelsea community is evident in a number of incidents. As we have shown, the Management Team voted against allowing the distribution of condoms in the high school despite widespread community sentiment and School Committee support in favor of their availability. For the first time in the history of the project, the Chelsea School Committee exercised its authority and overrode this decision. Months after this School Committee vote, however, the Management Team still had not made condoms available to students in the high school. In other words, BU did what it wanted to do, not what the community's representatives voted to do. This incident, although not particularly significant in the realm of educational issues per se, demonstrates BU's general unwillingness to listen to the community and its condescending approach to "educating" the Chelsea community.

BU's failure to incorporate the community into the decision-making process at appropriate times can be illustrated with numerous incidents throughout the so-called partnership. Members of the School Committee, for example, were presented with the 1992-93 school year budget at the same time as the general community. Its members had no input in the development of the budget, nor did the Management Team attempt to instruct School Committee members on the process. In addition, the School Committee was not included in the hiring of Peter Greer's replacement. Indeed, the School Committee has not even been invited to a number of official functions such as the opening of the health clinic at the high school.

The Chelsea-BU project has captured the interest of broad audiences not only for the programs BU has implemented under the banner of school reform but also for the unique governing structure imposed upon the effort. No university, public or private, has ever attempted to run an entire public school system. New structures and relationships — both formal and informal — were created that had never before been tested. The tone that has emerged in these relationships is very much shaped by some of the distinct personalities involved in implementing and managing the project. The official governing relationship between BU and Chelsea, as well as the informal working relationships between the two groups, has been very much affected by some of these personalities. Most specifically, John Silber's drive and, at times, single-mindedness has molded this project as much as any of the programs, governing arrangements, and

outside foundation grants. Indeed, his own style of managing BU is, in many ways, reflected in BU's style of managing Chelsea.

What then can be concluded from a school reform effort as complex as the Chelsea-BU project? Certainly many of the events and results of the first three years force one to question whether or not the project has been worth the effort. The outcomes — both measurable and not, both tangible and not — are mixed. Thus one is compelled to ask whether Chelsea students would be worse off if BU were not there.

The writers of this report do believe that Chelsea students have benefitted from BU's management of the Chelsea schools. Critics who employ test score results to discredit BU's efforts are not looking at the whole picture. BU has invested vast resources in Chelsea — both financial and human. Without these resources, the budget cuts resulting from receivership would have devastated the Chelsea schools to an even greater extent than they did. BU cushioned this blow considerably. BU has also done a relatively good job of crisis management, responding creatively, although not collaboratively with the community, to the many emergencies resulting from a lack of funds. Although Peter Greer described BU as the "Vince Lombardy or Larry Sonka of educational reform, continuously blocking and tackling educational crises," BU's ability to block some of the crises and tackle new approaches is admirable.

In addition, BU has affected the lives of Chelsea students beyond the realm of education. Innovative and comprehensive health and dental care services have been provided to large numbers of individuals. Furthermore, the flagship early childhood program now serves preschool-age children who would not otherwise have been served by the Chelsea school system.

Some of these efforts, particularly the early childhood program and the health services, could readily serve as models for other school systems interested in replicating successful programs in their own districts. Nuts and bolts descriptions of the ways these programs were designed and implemented could guide other administrators wishing to introduce similar programs in their schools.

What would be difficult to replicate, however, is the enormous in-kind contribution of resources which BU has provided to this project and the commitment and energy of a few individuals. While on the one hand BU must be praised for this contribution, on the other hand this very contribution has possibly resulted in the departure of several key players. It is curious that both Peter Greer and Ted Sharp left the Chelsea-BU project at the same time and after only a three year involvement. Although they have both provided a number of seemingly valid reasons to explain their leaving (e.g., "It was simply time to move on," "I never intended to stay more than a few years"), one must question whether they simply could not sustain the level of energy which the Chelsea-BU project required and which John Silber demanded.

One must also question whether other BU faculty hesitate to get involved because of the time, energy, and demands required and the lack of official academic rewards. After all, faculty at major research universities are not traditionally promoted for community service activities. And despite the fact that the Chelsea-BU partnership is a pet project of BU's president, there is no real

indication that faculty participation in the project is recognized by the broader university community.

The utility of the governing style employed by BU's rather strong personalities must also be considered. The educational reform literature, through both theory and example, warns against dictating school reform without the involvement of the community. It is not clear whether BU's top-down approach was necessary to survive the crises of the first three years. What is clear, however, is that this approach denies the community not only input into current decisions but also an understanding of the decision-making process and the programs that BU is imposing. Furthermore, BU's tenure in Chelsea is limited to ten years. At the conclusion of the project, part of BU's success will be determined by the community's ability to run its own schools. With three years of the project completed, one must ask when BU will begin to act as a mentor to Chelsea's leaders.

John Silber has described the project's greatest accomplishment as survival. We, too, believe that the survival of the project represents a major feat given the events of the first three years. We also believe that BU can take credit for its creative responses to a number of crises and for several innovative programs. As the project moves closer to its conclusion, however, isolated programs and mere survival will not be accomplishment enough. The ultimate success or failure of the Chelsea-BU project will not be measured in year five or year eight or even at the end of year ten. It will be determined in year eleven, and in each and every year thereafter, when the Chelsea School Committee takes over from the BU Management Team.

EPILOGUE

While it is too early to attribute either success or failure to Boston University after managing the Chelsea public schools for three years, a close look at this unique reform effort reveals important lessons that can inform other outside entities operating schools as well as the body of research on educational reform. These lessons, however, do not include some of the seemingly successful programs introduced by BU into the schools during the first three years of the partnership. Though these programs appear to be promising and to fill real needs in the community, it is too soon to draw conclusions about specific programs — especially conclusions that might prematurely encourage others to mimic BU's actions.

The initial lessons offered by BU's experiences are thus process-oriented rather than programmatic. They deal with "how" to go about implementing change. They are not a blueprint of educational and social programs that, if implemented, will yield improved test scores and well-rounded students. The lessons that follow should provide some useful guidelines, however, particularly for reform efforts that entail the administration of schools by outside agents.

Lesson 1: School reform in high poverty school districts requires attention to the physical, social, family, and economic problems of students as well as their educational needs.

BU recognized from the outset the need to pay attention to the multidimensional needs of Chelsea students. Several innovative programs, such as the early childhood education program, the health clinic in the high school, the intergenerational literacy program, and numerous human service efforts, illustrate BU's responsiveness to these needs. The fact that these programs have been well received testifies to their relevancy to the needs of a high poverty school district. Although it will be difficult to establish a direct causal link between any one of these efforts and student outcomes, these programs respond to major gaps in the lives of Chelsea students, gaps less familiar to students and educators in more middle-class school districts.

Lesson 2: Outside reform agents, whether universities or private corporations, should involve the community in the process from the outset.

In general, partnership arrangements are likely to be more successful if all parties, including the community, participate actively in the decision-making process. Some of the tensions and conflicts between BU and the Chelsea community, tensions which appear to have hindered progress, could have been reduced if the community had been allowed a voice in the decision-making process. By actively soliciting community input from day one, an entity in charge of school management will best be able to ensure acceptance and institutionalization of

new educational programs and practices. Although the Management Team, acting as school board, maintained the authority to make autonomous decisions, BU would have fared much better by establishing avenues of communication between the Management Team and the Chelsea community, as represented by the School Committee, community interest groups, and individuals. To be truly beneficial, these avenues must be actual and visible, not merely symbolic.

Lesson 3: Outside reform agents should be sensitive to different cultural and community perspectives.

This corollary to Lesson 2 encourages those involved in school reform to recognize and be sensitive to the different cultures and orientations of all key players. Sensitivity to various cultural perspectives must extend beyond merely providing programs for members of diverse ethnic and racial groups; it also involves hearing and responding to the voices of members of those groups. The wider Chelsea community, a predominantly ethnic population, has, at times, felt that BU did not appropriately tailor its programs to the cultural perspectives of the families they attempt to serve.

Outside reform agents also need to listen to teachers and administrators in the schools and to include them in the decision-making process as well. In Chelsea, teachers and principals have felt that they possess crucial knowledge and understanding of the Chelsea community and schools but that BU frequently has discounted the value of this knowledge and understanding. When "outsiders," like the BU team, enter a community, they are most likely to be successful if they seek the opinions and guidance of those they are coming to serve.

Lesson 4: Reform agents must be prepared to commit great amounts of time and energy.

Those engaged in school reform must be prepared to commit considerable time and energy to the task. Members of the BU faculty have devoted substantial amounts of time and energy to the partnership's efforts, and for the most part they conduct this work in addition to their regular duties as faculty members. The resources external to the Chelsea community devoted to the partnership — both from BU and from other outside entities — are substantial.

School reform agents should also be prepared to tap, actively and simultaneously, multiple sources of funds, materials, and human resources. However, these multiple resources need to be carefully coordinated to avoid potential conflicts in both goals and programs. It is all too easy to "take what one can get," particularly when financial resources are tight, and to lose sight of the overall goals toward which the effort is striving.

Lesson 5: Those involved with reforming schools need to develop both short- and long-term goals, but they should be flexible in the objectives they design to attain these goals.

Carefully planned goals are critical to the management of school reform efforts, yet these goals must be sufficiently flexible to allow for adaptations in schedules and programs intended to support their achievement. The BU experience in Chelsea clearly illustrates the need for school reformers to be willing to modify their short-term objectives. BU certainly did not anticipate Chelsea's financial crisis, but rather than abandon the project, BU opted to persevere. The reduction of resources, both financial and human, forced BU to change its short-term goals for the Chelsea schools and to adopt a more "crisis management" mode for year three.

Goals should not be discarded merely because progress toward them is not immediately apparent; rather, constant reevaluation of the time frame in which the goals are expected to be reached and the objectives developed to attain the goals should occur. At times, programs designed to meet goals may have to be delayed or revamped in order to accommodate unanticipated circumstances.

Lesson 6: School reform requires patience from all involved.

This lesson applies not only to implementers of school reform — policymakers, administrators, teachers, and other stakeholders alike — but also to onlookers and critics of reform efforts. Systems, educational or otherwise, cannot be transformed overnight. As difficult as it is, reformers and their critics must train themselves to accept incremental change and to postpone assessment of the endeavor as a whole to a time when educational programs and practices have had sufficient time to be embraced by individuals and institutionalized by schools.

REFERENCES

1991 1990 Population by Race and Hispanic Origin for Massachusetts Cities and Towns (1991). Amherst, MA: State Data Center, Massachusetts Institute for Social and Economic Research.

1992a Summary of Income Characteristics in 1989: Massachusetts Cities, Towns, and Selected Other Areas 1990 Census of Population and Housing, (1992) Amherst, MA: State Data Center, Massachusetts Institute for Social and Economic Research, Report 92-02.

1992b Educational Attainment: Massachusetts Cities, Towns, and Selected Other Areas 1990 Census of Population and Housing, (1992) Amherst, MA: State Data Center, Massachusetts Institute for Social and Economic Research, Report 92-03.

1992c Poverty Status of Persons in 1989: Massachusetts Cities, Towns, and Selected Other Areas 1990 Census of Population and Housing, (1992) Amherst, MA: State Data Center, Massachusetts Institute for Social and Economic Research, Report 92-08.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

List of Persons Interviewed During Site Visits of Years 2 and 3

BU Management Team

Robert Sperber
Ted Sharp*
Gerry Lewis*
Paul Clemente*
Lee Indrisano*
Carole Greenes*

BU Faculty and Staff

John Silber
Terry Lane*
Maria Brisk
Jeanne Paratore*
Vincent McLellan*
Maria Meyer*
Richard Colwell
Sandra Kranz
Kathy Vaughan
Stacy Swain*

Chelsea School Committee

Marta Rosa
Anthony Tiro*
Lydia Walata
Harry German
Morris Seigal*

Chelsea Principals and Assistant Principals

Elsa Wasserman*
John Andreadis*
Paula Finklestein*
Tony DiGregorio*
Carol Murphy**
Ron Toleos*
Andre Ravenelle*
Marianne Bond*

Chelsea School Department

Diana Lam
Meg Campbell
Richard Briana
Adam Rosman*
Peter Greer***

Chelsea Program Administrators and Teachers

Janis Rennie*
Linda Alioto-Robinson
Denise Hurley*
Peter Steriti
Irma Napoleon
Chanty Mar
Leigh Ann Orr*
Maggie Lodge*
Joan Ottinger
Robert Meek
Barbara Evans
Kathleen Kilgore
Laurie DiChiappari
Judy Schickedanz
Ed Weinstein
Paul Renzi*
Laura Coyle
Sheila Garnick
Lorry Bradley
Tracey Herbert

* Interviewed multiple times during years two and three of the partnership

** Multiple interviews, including while principal of Shurtleff school and Assistant Superintendent of Chelsea schools

*** Multiple interviews, including while chairperson of the BU management team and Superintendent of Chelsea schools

APPENDIX A (Continued)

List of Persons Interviewed During Site Visits of Years 2 and 3

Chelsea Community and City Government Representatives

Harry Spence
Marilyn Portnoy
Alderman O'Neil
Marlene Demko*
Carmella Oliver
Ed Marakowitz*
Sue Clark
Stephen Quigley

Members of State Government

Richard Voke
Thomas Birmingham
Bill Crowley

Other

Irwin Blumer (Chelsea Oversight Panel)
Gail Gall
Michael Sandler (A Different September Foundation)
Kathy Healey